



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2009

No. 37

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

SUPERFUND REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the budget that President Obama submitted to Congress last week calls for the reinstatement of the "polluter pays" principle for the Superfund program.

As someone who has been dealing with a Superfund site in my district for over 20 years, I am pleased that the President has added his important voice to this cause. I have introduced H.R. 564, the Superfund Reinvestment Act, which would implement his recommendations. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor it.

The Superfund program was created in 1980 to provide money to clean up the Nation's worst hazard sites where the party responsible for polluting was out of business or could not be identified. Superfund sites contain toxic contaminants that have been detected in drinking water wells, creeks and rivers, backyards and playgrounds all across America. Indeed, about 1 in 4 Americans lives within 4 miles of a Superfund site.

Communities impacted by these sites can face restrictions on water use and recreational activities as well as economic losses as property values decline due to contaminated land. In the worst cases, residents of the community can face serious health problems such as cardiac impact, infertility, low birth

rates, birth defects, leukemia, and other cancers and respiratory difficulties.

Approximately 30 percent of these sites are considered "orphan" sites where a responsible party cannot be found, cannot pay or refuses to pay. In these cases, the Superfund trust fund is tapped to help pay for the cleanup. That Superfund program has contributed to the cleanup of over 1,000 sites across America.

Before the tax expired in 1995, the money for the Superfund trust fund came mainly from taxes on the polluters, themselves—the oil and chemical companies—that profited from the sale or use of the chemicals being cleaned up. Because Congress in the past has not reauthorized the taxes, the rate of cleanup for Superfund sites has declined, and the burden for funding the cleanup of these toxic waste sites now falls on the shoulders of all tax-paying Americans, not those who were responsible for it.

By 2003, the balance in the Superfund trust fund had dwindled to zero, delaying 29 sites around the country. Today, the Superfund relies heavily on scarce general fund revenues, increasing the burden on American taxpayers at a time when cleanup costs are increasing. The lack of funding also reduces the EPA's leverage in forcing companies to clean up after their own sites. The delay has resulted in greater health risks to people living near Superfund sites. It has resulted in increased damage to local communities as sites remain a drain on the local tax base, and in the long run, it results in higher ultimate cleanup costs.

One of the sites that has experienced delay due to the EPA's lack of funding is the Portland Harbor Superfund site in my district, officially a Superfund site in December of 2000 but a source of concern for years. The sources of contamination include former and current industrial operations and, indeed, the

Federal Government, itself, because of World War II shipbuilding.

While a number of potentially responsible parties, such as the Port of Portland and the Northwest Natural Gas Company, have stepped forward to begin the cleanup process, it is expected that much of the pollution at the Portland Harbor site will be unaccounted for. Normally, this orphan share would be paid by the Superfund. Since there is no money in the fund, the EPA may decide to distribute the liability to those already identified responsible parties, significantly increasing their cleanup costs and serving as a disincentive for people to come forward and help voluntarily. This may be one of the largest and costliest in the program's history, but it is but one example around the country.

Many of the responsible parties are eager to clean up actions on the site, but the EPA has not even issued a record of decision to clean it up. The EPA tells us this record of decision is about 3 to 5 years away, which basically has been the same story for the past 9 years, in part, because we don't have the resources. In the meantime, contamination is negatively impacting navigation and redevelopment activities around the region, not to mention threatening the health and safety of those who live around the river.

Portland Harbor is one of many examples of sites around the country that will benefit from reinstating the Superfund taxes. Until it expired in 1995, the Superfund tax generated about \$1.7 billion a year to clean up these hazardous areas.

I hope that my colleagues will work with me to ensure that the polluters, not the general fund taxpayers, clean up our country's most hazardous waste sites by cosponsoring the Superfund Reinvestment Act, H.R. 564.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2887

BIG GOVERNMENT IS BACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BERKLEY). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the era of big government is back. President Obama's proposal last week on the budget raises the deficit to \$1.75 trillion. That is 12.3 percent of GDP. Even while rolling back the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, the Democrats' budget stills grows the deficit, and we've been told over the years that it was those tax cuts that created the deficit.

The national debt will double to \$20 trillion in just 8 years. Think of that, ladies and gentlemen, \$20 trillion. In the last 8 years, the budget rose only by \$4.9 trillion in comparison. The Obama administration will exceed that within their first 3 years. Beginning in 2012 and every year thereafter, the government will spend more than \$1 billion a day in net interest. Just think what we could do with that kind of money.

I've just been visited by representatives of School Food Service in the Fifth District of North Carolina. They tell me, unless the Federal Government increases its commitment to School Food Service, children in our country are going to go hungry. Think what we could do with \$1 billion a day.

By 2019, the government will spend \$1.7 billion per day on interest. Total spending is going to equal \$3.9 trillion in 2009. That's 27 percent of GDP, a record level and the highest level as a share of GDP since World War II. This spending is going to expand net entitlement spending by \$1 trillion over 10 years, and it includes a \$634 billion down payment on socialized medicine.

Medicaid spending will double in less than a decade, growing from \$201 billion in 2008 to \$403 billion by 2017, and there are no provisions for rooting out waste, fraud and abuse in this program. It's going to increase domestic—non-defense, non-veterans, non-homeland security—discretionary spending by at least 10 percent next year on top of the 8.7 percent increase this year.

Ladies and gentlemen, the American people can not stand this debt and can not stand this kind of spending.

The proposed budget also raises taxes by \$1.4 trillion during a recession. This includes tax increases on American business, small businesses and individuals. Furthermore, all Americans who use energy will be penalized with a new carbon tax. This energy tax negates the so-called "tax cut" for 95 percent of Americans, because 100 percent of Americans who use any form of energy are going to pay this tax.

It reinstates the death tax. This onerous tax punishes families for building up savings to pass on to their heirs, and it imposes an especially heavy burden on small businesses and family farms. It will penalize Americans for contributing to charities by increasing taxes by \$179.8 billion over 10 years.

The budget repeals seven different tax provisions for oil and gas pro-

ducers, including a manufacturing deduction and the expensing of drilling costs, which would effectively raise taxes on the industry by \$60 billion.

The new policy of Cap and Tax, or Cap and Trade, would impose a \$79 billion annual cost to the economy, or \$646 billion over 10 years. This is going to raise energy prices by an average of \$516 per year for each household.

We heard the President talk about responsibility and accountability. By my account, he mentioned "responsibility" seven times last week in his speech to Congress, and he mentioned "accountability" six times. Ladies and gentlemen, it is time that Congress lives up to its responsibility and becomes accountable for its spending and stops passing these spending costs along to future generations.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I wanted to talk about health care reform and start off by mentioning that, in my opinion, in the last month or so since President Barack Obama has taken office, more has been done under his auspices in terms of health care reform than probably has been done in the last 10 years. I specifically would mention the SCHIP—children's health care expansion—and those health initiatives, those health care reform initiatives that are in the economic recovery package. They are significant for many reasons.

First of all, if you look at the SCHIP, or the children's health care initiative, we have on the books or we had before this initiative for about 10 years a program that allowed working parents who did not receive health care on the job through their employers to be able to receive it through the State. These were people who were working but who were not poor enough to qualify for Medicaid. Yet, if they went out and tried to buy private insurance for their children and for themselves, they essentially were not able to because the private market is too expensive.

□ 1045

And so about 12 years ago, Democrats and Republicans, on a bipartisan basis, got together and set up the SCHIP children's health initiative, the Federal Government giving the States money to cover these kids in certain categories, maybe 200 percent of poverty or, in some cases, even as high as 300 percent of poverty. It worked.

About 7 million children who did not have health insurance were covered, and we decided as Democrats—and we tried to get some Republicans and actually did get some Republicans to support us—that we needed to expand it by another 4 or 5 million kids who were eligible for the program but were not receiving the benefits, either because the

States didn't have the money or because they couldn't reach them through their outreach programs.

So one of the first things that was done by this new Congress was to pass an SCHIP expansion bill. Actually, it had a two-thirds majority vote here in the House of Representatives—over 40 Republicans joined with Democrats—and President Obama signed the bill just a few weeks ago.

We know it's going to work. We know it's going to do a lot to expand health insurance for kids who do not have it, and that makes sense because the bottom line is that if people have health insurance, then they go to a doctor more frequently. They get preventive care. They don't have to go in an emergency room. They don't get sicker, which ultimately causes the Federal Government and the State government more money.

Let me talk about the economic recovery package. In the economic recovery package, there are a number of health care reform initiatives. First of all, there's money that goes back to the States, about \$80- to \$90 billion, to help them enroll people on Medicaid. Because of the recession, because more people now do not have a job and, therefore, lose their health insurance, the Medicaid rolls have expanded, but States can't afford to expand the Medicaid rolls and, in many cases, were already starting to limit who would be eligible for Medicaid. But now, the Federal Government is giving the States essentially about \$80- to \$90 billion to help them defray that cost so that anyone who's eligible for Medicaid would be able to receive it.

In addition to that, if you were employed and you lost your job, we have a system now called COBRA, which is an acronym, where if you do lose your job, you can pay the full cost of the health insurance that your employer was providing you and continue to have your existing health insurance that you had on the job for another 18 months. But the problem is you have to pay out of pocket 100 percent, actually 102 percent because of the administrative costs, because your employer is not contributing anymore. So, with the economic recovery package, the Federal Government now will pay 65 percent of the cost of COBRA which makes it a lot more affordable for those who are eligible for COBRA.

But beyond that, there are major reforms in the economic recovery package in health care, in many significant ways, not just the money. For example, there is a major initiative on preventive care. There's a major initiative on wellness, to basically teach people about staying healthy so they don't get sick and cost the system a lot of money. There's also \$20 billion for health information technology, so that hospitals and doctors can upgrade their systems and, rather than using paper, have all their records done electronically. This saves the system money.

What President Obama is trying to do in the economic recovery package is

basically lay the groundwork, if you will, for doing health care differently. If the emphasis is on prevention, if the emphasis is on wellness, if the emphasis is on new technologies that bring costs down because you can do things more effectively, then not only do you have less mistakes and a more efficient system, but you have a system that ultimately costs less money.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS II—MORE DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, with America facing an almost 8 percent unemployment rate, record low consumer confidence, and this country's worst economic downturn since the beginning of World War II, our Nation needs a real economic stimulus package that will give tax relief to hurting American businesses, create long-term sustainable job growth, and provide real permanent tax relief to American families. What this country does not need is the Federal Government increasing our national debt to record levels, burying our children and our grandchildren under a mountain of debt.

This Democrat spending plan is simply not stimulative. According to CBO, the plan includes over \$600 billion in new spending. There are some tax cuts, but of the \$816 billion in the program, the majority is for new spending, from 2009 to 2019. While this plan is aimed at quickly injecting government cash into the economy, only 15 percent of the spending will occur during this fiscal year, and only 37 percent of the spending will occur in fiscal year 2010. This means that over half of the plan's spending will occur starting in the year 2011, hardly a quick injection into the lagging economy as promised by the Democrat authors.

Many have looked to our economic history to provide guidance for us today during this difficult time. Particularly, they've looked at the New Deal under President Roosevelt. Unfortunately, what many economists have found is that the New Deal principles are stale ideas that do not translate into economic stimulus for our economy in the 21st century.

First, the Great Depression began in 1929 and did not end until 1940. And the stock market did not return to the level of September 3, 1929, until 1954. If today's economy were to go through a similar recovery, we would not fully escape the current recession until the year 2018, and the Dow would not reach its high of 2007 until the year 2032.

Secondly, many economists note that during the Great Depression the United States did not actually have much of an expansionary fiscal policy. As Tyler Cowen stated in the New York Times article, *The New Deal Didn't Always Work*, Either, "Under President Herbert Hoover and continuing with Roosevelt, the Federal Government in-

creased income taxes, excise taxes, inheritance taxes, corporate income tax, holding company taxes and 'excess profits' taxes. When all of these tax increases are taken into account, the New Deal fiscal policy didn't do much to promote recovery."

This legislation is also an unprecedented expansion of the nation's debt burden. The U.S. is projected to have a \$1.2 trillion deficit in FY 2009 even without the enactment of any stimulus legislation. As a percentage of GDP, the projected FY 2009 deficit (8.3% of GDP) is considerably larger than any deficit during the Great Depression (the highest was 5.4% of GDP in 1934).

The year 2008 could easily be defined as the year of the bailout. The months have passed in a torrent of troubling government "rescues" of private sector financial firms. Those bailouts have come at a great price and have exposed American taxpayers to vast financial risk. And in a financial crisis, such as the one we are now facing, bailout after bailout is quite simply not a good strategy for recovery.

Since October of 2008, the U.S. Treasury has committed \$350 billion in public funds to private financial institutions, many of which have utilized reckless investment strategies, through the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP).

Specifically, insurance giant AIG has received \$40 billion, Citigroup—which just tried to spend \$50 billion on a luxury corporate jet—has received \$20 billion, an additional \$20 billion has been given to the Federal Reserve, and \$250 billion has gone to large national banks in the form of direct capital injections. Even more troubling is the \$23 billion of these TARP funds, which has been allocated to bail out automobile manufacturers such as General Motors and Chrysler. This type of government intervention in the private sector is unprecedented and has put us on a precarious path to socialism.

Given the massive amount of money the Federal Government has spent on bailouts since March of 2008, along with the ever-increasing debt level, it is unconscionable to continue committing good money after bad. This money belongs to the American taxpayer, and now, more than ever, we must rein in this out-of-control government spending for our future generations who will have to pay back this irresponsible debt accumulation.

Madam Speaker, we need to turn off the government spigot of Federal funding into non-stimulative debt spending. It is time for Congress to pass a real economic stimulus package that will give tax relief to hurting American businesses, create long-term sustainable growth, and provide real permanent tax relief to American families.

THE LAW OF UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I'd like to offer a word of caution about the law of unintended consequences.

Last week, this House passed the administration's proposal to allow homeowners to force banks to reduce the size of their mortgages and their interest payments.

Well, there are millions of families, including my own I might add, who now owe more on our mortgages than our homes are worth, and yet more than 90 percent of homeowners continue to make our mortgage payments in hopes of better days to come.

Question: How many of these people who have been faithfully making their mortgage payments will now take advantage of this new law to reduce their mortgage debt by tens or even hundreds of thousands of dollars?

And while we're at it, here's another question. As these borrowers decide to cash in on this windfall, how many additional banks will fold as the value of these otherwise perfectly sound mortgages is crammed down by this new law?

And a final question: How high will the surviving banks raise their interest rates and down payment requirements to protect themselves against future governmental interventions?

I'm afraid that all we will have done is to create a society where fewer banks will be able to make loans and fewer home buyers will be able to access loans and produce an additional downward spiral in home values.

Madam Speaker, the law of unintended consequences is beyond Congress' jurisdiction, and we would do well to heed it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR of Arizona) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Lawrence L. Vollink offered the following prayer:

Always, Lord God, You have been our help in days past. You have been our hope for the days ahead. We are so overwhelmed that out of Your love, You lead us, You protect us, You sustain us, and You bring comfort to Your people, sometimes miraculously, and at other times, from a distance. And to us has been given that sacred trust to bring honor and goodness to all people.

We again ask for Your wisdom to be given to our Representatives as they

uphold what is right and true. May You always be near to guide in their decisions, to comfort them in their failures, and to keep them humble in their successes. Give us faith, Lord, that we can see in every difficulty there is an opportunity, and in every blessing there is a responsibility, and in every purpose a task.

Lord, we ask for Your watchful eye to be upon our troops wherever they are serving. And be with their families that love them dearly and for those who are grieving their loss at this time. We give thanks for all of the organizations who have given support to make our troops return safe and sure.

Wherever we are serving, help us to accomplish great and good things for our States and for our Nation, now and forever. We pray for Thy glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution and a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week.

S.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously.

WELCOMING REV. LAWRENCE L. VOLLINK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I'm very honored to be here to welcome Chaplain Larry Vollink and his wife, Susie, who was also in the counterintelligence field in the United States military during her day. They're in Washington, D.C. for the annual Washington American Legion Conference. The chaplain is the national chaplain for the American Legion. He lives in Ypsilanti,

Michigan, a graduate of South High School, the very same high school that Gerald Ford attended.

He's retired from the Army after 20 years of service to his country. He was stationed in Germany, Fort Campbell, Fort Carson and Selfridge Air Base in Michigan.

He has pastored churches in Ohio and Illinois and Michigan. He has served as a pastor and continues to serve as a pastor in hospitals and Hospice around the mid-Michigan area.

He has committed and dedicated his life to the military families that he loves and respects and is a part of. He has nourished their souls and strengthened their faith. We are honored to have him today lead us in prayer and through the challenging days that lie ahead of this great Nation. And we welcome not only his wife, Susie, but the entire Michigan delegation that has joined him. He's got one heck of a cavalry in his reserve.

BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. The President has presented his budget, and it really is a blueprint for the future. It's time to end the responsibility that's been created over the last decade and return us back to some honest accounting principles; to making certain that we put everything in the pot, examine line by line the budget, and make the kind of investments in the future that will strengthen our economy and grow our economy for our children.

And what does that mean? Investments in clean energy, so that we're no longer dependent on fossil fuels and foreign oil; investments in renewable energy, wind and solar, and biofuels.

We'll make sure that we have a health care system that really works for every American, making sure that we have quality affordable access to health care. This is an investment that the President has put before us in his budget, and it's an investment whose time is overdue.

Investments in education that make certain that from pre-Kindergarten through high school and then on-going learning we are preparing a workforce for the future, a workforce for the 21st century economy. And then, of course, making sure that we invest in our infrastructure, in water and sewer and transportation and broadband, in an electrical grid for the future, being certain that we've made the kinds of investments. The President has presented a budget that makes the kind of investments that will restore us to a strengthened economy in the 21st century.

WHAT'S A TRILLION DOLLARS?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in February this House passed two bills that are well over \$1 trillion: the illusive Stimulus Bill that rewards special interest groups, and the Omnibus Appropriations Bill. Both were passed.

There are even more high-dollar government programs being planned in back rooms of this Capitol.

So how much is \$1 trillion? Well, it's 1 with 12 zeros behind it. It will buy you 36 million Chevrolet Malibus. It's spending \$1,000 a day at the mall for 2.5 million years. Or it will pay the college education for every high school graduate for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this spending is we don't have the money, so we're going have to borrow it or raise taxes. Both of those are bad ideas. This big government spending spree agenda is not helping our economy. The stock market keeps going down. Congress is forcibly taking money from Americans to spend on programs that don't work, and also acquiring debt that Americans yet to be born will have to pay for.

And that's just the way it is.

A CLEAR, VISIONARY BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, we were given the most honest, visionary and fair budget that we have gotten in 8 years. It includes the cost of the wars and the cost of patching the Alternative Minimum Tax which the Bush budgets were never willing to do. It invests in an education and energy future that will sustain a strong prosperous economy. And the fact is that it is fair.

Now, that's going to be the talking point, that it does allow taxes to be restored on those who have seen the highest income growth over the last 8 years, the wealthiest 2 percent of our society. This issue has historically been a defining feature of America, that people who benefit the most from our economic prosperity should pay for the cost of the military that defends that wealth, should pay for the cost of the roads and the rails that transport that wealth, and, in fact, should pay for the cost of educating the workforce that produces that wealth.

This budget, for the first time in 8 years, is not dead on arrival. This is a clear visionary blueprint for America's future, and we should support it.

SAVE TOURS OF THE CAPITOL

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. JIM MORAN worked to save tours of the Capitol, and Congressman LOEBSACK and I have now authored a bipartisan letter to the Architect of

the Capitol urging him to restore the rights of Members and staff to offer tours to our constituents.

The red coats of the CVC do not own the Capitol. Members of Congress do not own the Capitol. The American people bought and paid for it, but the CVC red coats now block Americans from seeing the Capitol with their Congressmen or staff.

We are headed to a train wreck when CVC red coats turn away thousands of American families from the Capitol over spring break. They say, sure, we'll handle your constituents, no problem. Actually, they're going to block the access of the American people to the Capitol.

Now, a recent Facebook posting by a CVC red coat reflected a stunning arrogance that should not be tolerated towards American citizens.

I urge Members to sign the bipartisan Loebbeck-Kirk letter to ensure that your constituents can see the Capitol when they want, with their Member of Congress, and not be blocked by the CVC red coats.

PRESIDENT OBAMA LOOKS TO BRING HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE BUDGET PROCESS

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, last week President Obama continued to bring real change to Washington by announcing his plan to bring honesty and accountability to the budget process.

For the last 8 years, the Bush administration and Washington Republicans masked the true costs of their budget by refusing to include funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and refusing to include any funding for natural disasters, even though we all knew they would happen. These accounting gimmicks were used to make deficit projections look smaller than they actually were.

These tricks will soon be a thing of the past, as President Obama wants the American people to have facts so they can hold us all accountable. That's the way government should work, and thanks to President Obama's commitment to honesty in government, it will be instituted as part of his budget outline later this week.

Mr. Speaker, for years, congressional Democrats criticized the Bush administration for using these gimmicks, and so we commend President Obama for this very welcome change.

EARMARKS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the President is expected to sign the omnibus appropriations bill this week, once the Senate acts on the bill.

Since the President made numerous promises to reduce earmarks during his campaign, the American people should know what is in the bill that he will be signing, another 1,100-plus page bill. This is a \$410 billion spending bill which contains 8,500 earmarks, including \$300,000 for migrating loons in Nevada, \$900,000 for planetarium equipment in Chicago, \$190,000 for trolleys in Puerto Rico, \$3 million for a foot bridge in St. Louis, \$380,000 for a light-house in Maine, \$1 million for red snappers in Florida, \$7 million for sea turtles in Hawaii, and on and on.

Migratory loons in Nevada? Red snappers in Florida? Trolleys in Puerto Rico? In a time of trillion dollar deficits, enough is enough!

92ND ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP

(Mr. PIERLUISI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, 92 years ago, President Wilson signed a bill and the people of Puerto Rico became U.S. citizens.

Puerto Rico's relationship with the United States is as close as it is complex. In some instances, promises of equal treatment took too long to redeem, and there are aspects of the relationship that should trouble men and women of conscience.

But like so many American stories, this is a chronicle of progress and a determined march towards a more perfect union. For me, as for millions of my constituents, the pride we feel in being Puerto Rican is matched by the pride we feel in being American citizens. To those who express concern that any further strengthening of the bond between Puerto Rico and the U.S. will result in a weakening of Puerto Rico's identity, I submit that history and experience demonstrate otherwise.

The people of Puerto Rico have been fighting for our country ever since they became citizens. American soldiers from Puerto Rico, fiercely proud of their country and their island roots, provide powerful testimony that these feelings complement, rather than contradict, one another.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary, I salute the 4 million U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico.

GOVERNMENT MEDDLING IN MARKETS

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Pilgrim's Pride Poultry Company announced the closing of three chicken processing operations throughout the southeastern United States.

In and around my district in North Louisiana, 1,300 jobs were lost. It is important for the American public to know why and how these jobs were

lost. In addition to the decline in consumer protein demand, Pilgrim's Pride was most affected by high feed prices causing a loss in the last year of over \$1 billion, forcing them into bankruptcy.

The main cause of these high prices was Federal mandates to increase the use of ethanol. This large spike in corn prices is being felt throughout the country by consumers and producers alike. Is this a foreshadowing of more disasters to come because of the governmental manipulation of the energy markets?

Just like the mortgage debacle, governmental meddling in markets continues hurting the working family, both directly and indirectly.

FAIRNESS IN TAXES

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, President Obama offered his first budget to this House last week, and it calls for fairness that hasn't been seen in this American government for a long time, fairness in taxes between the most wealthy and the least fortunate, people who need help and people who need to provide help, a budget that provides for health care, for energy, for veterans, most of all, for the issues that are most important to the American public. Investments in our infrastructure, which will spur this economy and stimulate the economy.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with the Democrats in supporting our President who was elected with overwhelming numbers and still has overwhelming support. Confidence and support for this President is what's necessary to give people the confidence to invest in our economy and get us out of this recession.

□ 1215

BUDGET

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, in the President's address to the joint session of Congress, he said unequivocally he was opposed to bigger government. Yet the President's budget does exactly the opposite. Big government is back and is bigger than before. Under the President's plan, the national debt will double to \$20 trillion. We cannot sustain this; we cannot afford this, and we simply must say, "No."

The President said, "If your family earns less than \$250,000 a year, you will not see your taxes increase a single dime. I repeat: not a single dime."

Yet the President's budget calls for significant tax increases that will be paid by every American, by 100 percent of us. Let us remember it is not the

government's money we talk about and spend. It is the American people's money. We cannot afford to continue to run this government on a credit card. We are going to have to do more with less, and that means finding ways to cut government spending.

THE PASSING OF REV. MICHAEL "THE SOWER" GUIDO

(Mr. BARROW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness to pay tribute to the life of a constituent of mine, Dr. Michael Guido. Rev. Guido, known to millions as "the Sower," died at the age of 94 last Saturday.

Michael Guido came to Metter, Georgia in 1943 for a preaching trip. After he met the woman who would later become his wife, he decided to stay. Sixty-six years later, he leaves behind his bride, Audrey, and a ministry that is broadcast on over 100 television stations and 400 radio stations around the world. He also wrote a column, "Seeds from the Sower," which was published in over 1,300 newspapers across our land.

Rev. Guido built an impressive ministry, but his goal was not fortune or fame; it was just to live his life like the sower in Christ's parable—sowing the word of God on sometimes stony ground and keeping faith in his God and with his fellow man. His brother, Larry, carries on Rev. Guido's work, and his memory will live on in the souls he helped lead to God during his long life.

The Bible says, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches and loving favor rather than silver or gold." Michael Guido made a good name for himself, which lives on in the loving favor of literally millions of souls, which is worth more than all the silver and gold in all the world.

SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Sierra Pacific Industries just announced the closure of its sawmill in the little town of Quincy, California, in my district, throwing another 150 families out of work. They made it very clear that the recession was not the cause; it was merely the catalyst. The real cause is that the regulatory costs and litigation, because of regulation, now exceed their profit margin. In fact, two-thirds of their timber harvest this year is tied up as a result of government actions.

Sierra Pacific constructed this small log mill when Congress passed legislation promoting tree thinning in the surrounding forests to prevent forest fires, but that law has not been implemented because of endless litigation by environmental groups who are using an impenetrable web of environmental laws.

In their press release, Sierra Pacific notes, "Nearly two-thirds of the current year's timber sale program is enjoined or withheld from sale pending the outcome of litigation."

So, Mr. Speaker, today, another 150 families in the little town of Quincy are out of work, direct casualties of this retrograde, Luddite ideology.

HONORING TANYA LOMBARDI

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of National Kidney Month and in honoring Tanya Lombardi, a courageous kidney donor.

Four years ago, Tanya joined a local book club in Danville, California. There she met Maxine Moir. Maxine needed a new kidney, but couldn't find a donor. In response, Tanya offered her kidney to Maxine, displaying great compassion and courage. This past December, Tanya provided Maxine with a miraculous holiday gift. Since the successful transplant, Tanya and Maxine take weekly walks and remain close friends, a friendship extending from a unique and incredible relationship that began at the book club.

Selfless donors like Tanya gave more than 13,000 kidneys in 2008, but many more people need help. Brave acts of kindness like those by Tanya Lombardi continue to bring hope to thousands of people and show that each of us can make a difference.

I urge my colleagues to join me during National Kidney Month in recognizing the selfless acts of kidney donors across America.

HONORING THE AMERICAN LEGION

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express my appreciation for the great work the American Legion does for our Nation's veterans.

As a proud Legionnaire myself, this morning, I had the great honor of addressing the Commander's Call. This afternoon, I will meet with fellow Minnesotan Legionnaires Brad Lindsay, Bill Goede and Marie Goede, Floyd Kumerow, Robert Hirmer, and Chuck Kruger.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I look to the American Legion for guidance on the priorities of our Nation's veterans. It is because, every day, the Legion is out there, working with our veterans. They understand what is needed.

I see it as this Congress' responsibility to work with the VA budgets that are not just sufficient but timely to make sure that they're predictable and that we serve our veterans the way we should. We have an absolute respon-

sibility to knock down the backlog of claims that our veterans are facing, and we need to ensure that the recently enacted GI Bill is put to use as it should be. In all of this, the American Legion is a crucial partner.

There is another side to the Legion that doesn't get mentioned that much. It is the daily activities serving our veterans and their communities. From their great civic education programs, Boys and Girls State, to youth baseball and other programs, this is the truly great work the Legion does, and I want to commend them. We are all better for it. Our Nation's veterans are better for the work the Legion does.

ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP FOR THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, I rise today to join my colleagues in marking the 92nd anniversary of President Woodrow Wilson's signing of an Act of Congress, conferring United States citizenship upon the people of Puerto Rico. This act marked an important advancement in the United States-Puerto Rico relationship, and although it is still an unfinished journey, it brought our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico into the American family.

The people of Puerto Rico have a rich and a beautiful culture. Their work to preserve and to celebrate their culture and their contributions to our democracy and defense of our Nation are unmatched by any State.

Today, we recognize the act that conferred them citizenship, and we commemorate this event with them as we look forward to their continuing political progress. The people of Guam join our fellow Americans in congratulating Puerto Rico.

JOB CREATION

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we are looking for job creation opportunities during these tough economic times.

This morning, I heard ideas from an unexpected source. I was at a bipartisan symposium with Senators, Governors, former Prime Minister Tony Blair, and business leaders. What I heard from the business leaders is that one of the best sources of job creation we have is in creating new green collar, clean energy jobs to respond to our climate crisis, which will also help us in our economic crisis.

Jeff Immelt of GE told us about the need for a smart grid so we can create green-collar jobs. Mr. Hayes from Florida Power and Light told us about the great technologies in solar power. We

heard from Vinod Khosla about ways to sequester carbon dioxide in building material.

At this moment of economic stress, we should not forget that responding to climate change is a potential way to get over our economic doldrums. Let's keep this clean energy ball rolling.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM SPOELHOF

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 91) honoring the life and service of Dr. William Spoelhof, president emeritus of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 91

Whereas Dr. William Spoelhof was born on December 8, 1909, in Paterson, New Jersey, and passed away on December 3, 2008, at the age of 98;

Whereas in 1931, Dr. Spoelhof graduated from Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and began teaching social studies at the middle school level;

Whereas in 1937, Dr. Spoelhof received a Master of Arts degree and began his doctoral studies at the University of Michigan;

Whereas during World War II, Dr. Spoelhof served our country by joining the Office of Strategic Services in 1942 and enlisting in the Navy in 1943;

Whereas following the war, Dr. Spoelhof completed his doctoral work at the University of Michigan, and, in 1946, returned to Calvin College to teach history and political science;

Whereas in 1956, 5 years after becoming president of Calvin College, Dr. Spoelhof oversaw the process of moving Calvin College from its original Franklin Street campus located near downtown Grand Rapids to its current Knollcrest campus in southeast Grand Rapids;

Whereas Dr. Spoelhof carefully balanced Calvin College's vision for excellence in academics with its relationship with the Christian Reformed Church, as he effectively steered the College through church conflicts and the tumultuous, nationwide student protests of the 1960s;

Whereas in 1976, after 25 years of service as an administrator, Dr. Spoelhof became the longest-serving president in Calvin College's history to date and announced his retirement;

Whereas after his formal retirement, Dr. Spoelhof was named president emeritus and maintained an office and steady presence at the College, offering continued support and goodwill whenever needed;

Whereas Dr. Spoelhof was a Christian role model and mentor to many faculty members,

staff, and students, as he provided wisdom and counsel to thousands of individuals during his more than 6 decades of service to Calvin College;

Whereas Dr. Spoelhof is fondly remembered for his contributions to daily discussions with retired faculty and students at the "Emeritorium" and for his kind words to passersby around the campus;

Whereas on December 3, 2004, Calvin College physics and astronomy professor, Larry Molnar, discovered an asteroid, and named it Asteroid 129099 Spoelhof in honor of Dr. Spoelhof;

Whereas Dr. Spoelhof was a respected leader in the Christian Reformed Church denomination, an educator of generations of teachers and ministers through programs at Calvin College, a faithful presence at the denominational Synod meetings, and a loyal member of the Neland Avenue Christian Reformed Church;

Whereas Dr. Spoelhof was awarded the Bronze Star Medal by the Navy for his service in World War II;

Whereas, for his contributions in liaison with the Dutch Resistance Movement, Dr. Spoelhof was honored by Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands with the Order of Orange-Nassau with swords and a laurel wreath;

Whereas in 1935, Dr. Spoelhof married Miss Angeline Nydam, and they had three children, Robert Spoelhof, Elsa Scherphorn, and Peter Spoelhof;

Whereas Ange, as Dr. Spoelhof lovingly called his wife, passed away in 1994; and

Whereas Dr. Spoelhof lived a life of gratitude and desired to bring God's glory in all he did, and, on December 3, 2008, the Calvin College community lost a visionary leader and wise friend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the life of Dr. William Spoelhof and his outstanding devotion and service as a member of the military, teacher, and professor, president, and friend of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on House Resolution 91.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 91, which honors the life and achievements of Dr. William Spoelhof, a long-time president of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Dr. Spoelhof, a decorated war hero, a dedicated member of the Christian Reformed Church and father of three, passed away at the age of 98 on December 3, 2008.

Born in Paterson, New Jersey in 1909, Dr. Spoelhof graduated from Calvin College in 1931 and began teaching social studies in a local middle school. He left to pursue a Master of Arts degree, first at Columbia University, then transferring to the University of Michi-

gan where he received his degree in 1937, beginning his doctoral studies immediately afterwards.

He deferred his studies during World War II, serving our Nation in the Office of Strategic Services, then enlisting in the Navy. The Navy recognized his service by awarding him a Bronze Star Medal, and for his efforts with the Dutch Resistance Movement, Dr. Spoelhof was honored by Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands with the order of Orange-Nassau.

After receiving his doctorate from the University of Michigan in 1946, Spoelhof returned to Calvin College to begin his long and distinguished career there. He began teaching history and political science at the college, and became president in 1951. Dr. Spoelhof was a dedicated member of the Neland Avenue Christian Reformed Church, which had a very close relationship with Calvin College. Dr. Spoelhof effectively led the college through church conflicts and student protests of the turbulent 1960s as well as oversaw Calvin College's move from its Franklin Street location to its current Knollcrest campus. Today, one of the principal buildings in this 400-acre campus is the William Spoelhof College Center.

After 25 years of service to Calvin College, Dr. Spoelhof retired in 1976 as the longest serving president in the college's history. After his formal retirement, Dr. Spoelhof was named president emeritus, maintaining an office and continuing to act as a mentor for countless faculty members, staff and students. He was also honored by a Calvin College professor, Larry Molnar, who discovered an asteroid in 2004 and named it "Spoelhof."

Dr. Spoelhof and his wife, Angeline Nydam, who passed away in 1994, had three children together: Robert, Peter and Elsa Scherphorn.

A committed servant and role model in his community, William Spoelhof's dedication to his college, his church and his country sets a prime example for our Nation to follow. I would like to have this opportunity to recognize his life and accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 91, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). This resolution honors the life and service of William Spoelhof, president emeritus of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dr. Spoelhof was born in 1909 in Paterson, New Jersey, and passed away on December 3, 2008, at the age of 98. He graduated from Calvin College in 1931 and began teaching social studies at the middle school level. In 1937, he received his Master of Arts degree, and began his doctoral studies at the University of Michigan.

□ 1230

During World War II, Dr. Spoelhof enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served

our country in the Office of Strategic Services. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal by the Navy for his service. Also, for his contributions in liaison with the Dutch Resistance Movement, Dr. Spoelhof was honored by Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands with the Order of Orange-Nassau with swords and a laurel wreath.

Following the war, in 1946, he completed his doctoral work and returned to Calvin College to teach history and political science. After becoming President of Calvin College, Dr. Spoelhof oversaw the process of moving Calvin College from its original Franklin Street campus, located in urban Grand Rapids, to its current campus in southeast Grand Rapids.

Dr. Spoelhof carefully balanced Calvin College's vision for excellent academics with its relationship with the Christian Reformed Church as he effectively steered the college through occasional church conflicts and the tumultuous, nationwide student protests of the 1960s.

In 1976, after 25 years of service as an administrator, Dr. Spoelhof became the longest-serving president in Calvin College's history to date. After his formal retirement, he was named president emeritus and maintained an office and steady presence at the college, offering continued support and goodwill whenever needed.

Dr. Spoelhof was a Christian role model and mentor to many faculty members, staff and students as he provided wisdom and counsel to thousands during his more than six decades of service to Calvin College. Dr. Spoelhof lived a life of gratitude and desired to give glory to God in all that he did.

On December 3, 2008, Calvin College lost a visionary leader and wise friend. He is to be honored and recognized for his outstanding devotion and service as a member of the military, a Calvin College professor, and president and friend.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Michigan for introducing this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 91, to honor the life and service of William Spoelhof, president emeritus of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. I am honored to represent Calvin College and am very thankful for its excellent education efforts. I am also proud to say that I attended Calvin College, and served as a professor of Physics at Calvin College.

Dr. William Spoelhof was born in 1909 in Paterson, New Jersey, and passed away on December 3, 2008, at the age of 98.

William Spoelhof graduated from Calvin College in 1931, and began teaching social studies at the middle school level. In 1937, he received his Masters of Arts degree, and began his doctoral studies at the University of Michigan.

During World War II, Dr. Spoelhof enlisted in the U.S. Navy, and served our country in the Office of Strategic Services. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal by the Navy for this service. Also, for his contributions in li-

aision with the Dutch Resistance Movement, Dr. Spoelhof was honored by Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands with the Order of Orange-Nassau with swords and a laurel wreath.

Following the war, in 1946, he completed his doctoral work, and returned to Calvin College to teach history and political science. After becoming president of Calvin College, Dr. Spoelhof oversaw the process of moving Calvin College from its original Franklin Street campus, located in urban Grand Rapids, to its current campus in southeast Grand Rapids.

Dr. Spoelhof carefully balanced Calvin College's vision for excellent academics with its relationship with the Christian Reformed Church, as he effectively steered the college through occasional church conflicts and the tumultuous, nationwide student protests of the 1960s.

In 1976, after 25 years of service as an administrator, Dr. Spoelhof became the longest-serving president in Calvin College's history to date and announced his retirement.

After his formal retirement, he was named president emeritus and maintained an office and steady presence at the College, offering continued support and goodwill whenever needed.

William Spoelhof was married to Miss Angeline Nydam in 1935, and they had three children, Robert Spoelhof, Elsa Scherphorn, and Peter Spoelhof. Ange, as Dr. Spoelhof lovingly called his wife, passed away in 1994, after almost 60 years of marriage.

Dr. Spoelhof was a Christian role model and mentor to many faculty members, staff and students, as he provided wisdom and counsel to thousands during his more than six decades of service to Calvin College.

On a personal note, Dr. Spoelhof recruited me from the University of California at Berkeley to teach Physics at Calvin College. I am deeply grateful for his guidance and for leading me to teach at a wonderful, Christian liberal arts college.

Dr. Spoelhof lived a life of gratitude, and desired to bring God glory in all he did. On December 3, 2008, the Calvin College community lost a visionary leader and wise friend. He is to be honored and recognized for his outstanding devotion and service as a member of the military, a Calvin College professor and president and friend.

It is with sincere admiration to him, and gratitude to God, that I pay my respects to Dr. Spoelhof on a life well lived, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 91, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the reso-

lution (H. Res. 77) congratulating the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, Virginia, for more than 100 years of service and leadership to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 77

Whereas, on March 14, 1908, Virginia Governor Claude A. Swanson signed into law legislation for the establishment of the new State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Fredericksburg, Virginia;

Whereas in 1938, the institution was renamed Mary Washington College in honor of Mary Ball Washington, the mother of President George Washington;

Whereas in 1970, the Virginia General Assembly approved full coeducational status for Mary Washington College, and men were enrolled as resident students for the first time;

Whereas in 2004, the Virginia General Assembly approved university status to the institution, changing its name to the University of Mary Washington;

Whereas the University of Mary Washington enrolls over 5,000 students and employs over 1,000 full-time and part-time faculty and staff;

Whereas in 2008, U.S. News and World Report ranked the University of Mary Washington as third among public, southern, master's degree-granting schools;

Whereas the University of Mary Washington has been led by eight presidents: Edward H. Russell (1908-1919), Algernon B. Chandler, Jr. (1919-1928), Morgan L. Combs (1929-1955), Grellet C. Simpson (1956-1974), Prince B. Woodard (1974-1982), William M. Anderson, Jr. (1983-2006), William J. Frawley (2006-2007), and Judy G. Hample (2008-);

Whereas the University of Mary Washington offers 43 degree programs, including 32 undergraduate programs, 4 graduate programs, 7 education specialist programs;

Whereas in its centennial year, the University of Mary Washington conferred more than 1,200 master's and bachelor's degrees;

Whereas the University of Mary Washington Intercollegiate Athletic Program sponsors 23 NCAA Varsity Teams, and the student-athletes on these teams have won five Individual and Team National Championships, produced 245 All-America Selections and more than 100 Academic All-Americans, and won more Conference Championships than any other school in the Capital Athletic Conference; and

Whereas in 2009, the University of Mary Washington begins a new century of academic excellence, service to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and leadership to the world in producing people of insight, wisdom, character, and accomplishment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, Virginia, for more than 100 years of leadership and service to the Fredericksburg area, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members

may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 77 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 77, which celebrates the University of Mary Washington's 100 years of service and leadership.

Founded in 1908, the State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Fredericksburg eventually became what is now known as the University of Mary Washington. Beginning with just 110 students, the school has grown into a prestigious university worthy of its namesake.

Long-standing traditions, combined with rigorous scholarship, enable the University of Mary Washington to provide one of the finest liberal arts educations in the Nation. Offering more than 40 undergraduate majors, four graduate programs and seven education specialist programs, UMW is highly ranked in every publication. The university is committed to academic excellence, and according to the "Fiske Guide to Colleges," UMW is described as "one of the premium or premiere public liberal arts colleges in the country." During its centennial year alone, UMW conferred more than 1,200 degrees.

With more than 5,000 enrolled students, the University of Mary Washington turns out students capable of extending their classroom knowledge into their communities and the world. UMW has a strong reputation of service, with 20 alumni currently serving in the Peace Corps. In fact, for the sixth year in a row, the Peace Corps has named the university to its annual list of "Top Producing Colleges and Universities." The spirit of service has benefited the community and the students well as they prepare to tackle the challenges of our increasingly globalized world.

When the university community came together to celebrate its century of existence and achievement last year, it renewed its commitment to excellence and success. As the university looks ahead to its future, may it continue to link its students and its community to the great tradition of its past and promise of its future.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, congratulate the University of Mary Washington and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 77, congratulating the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, Virginia, for more than 100 years of service and leadership to the United States.

The University of Mary Washington was founded in 1908 and has become an

institution of higher education that links traditions of the republic to innovations at the leading edge of pedagogy and research. Mary Washington has one of the leading public liberal arts colleges in the country, as well as a graduate and professional school.

The University of Mary Washington was originally founded as a women's college and was designated as the women's college for the University of Virginia in 1944. In 1970, Mary Washington College transitioned to a co-educational college and was designated "University of Mary Washington" in 2004 to reflect the inclusion of its growing graduate programs.

Located in Fredericksburg, Virginia, approximately 4,000 undergraduate students are enrolled at Mary Washington's main campus, located on Marye's Heights, which played an important role in the 1862 Battle of Fredericksburg.

In addition, approximately 1,000 students and adults attend the graduate and professional school located in nearby Stafford County. Students from 43 different countries are enrolled in 40 different majors and programs of study at Mary Washington.

The University of Mary Washington is ranked in every major selective guide publication. It was ranked fourth in its class by U.S. News and World Report, in the top ten nationally in Peace Corps alumni, and has a Pulitzer Prize-winning poet on the faculty. It was listed among Kiplinger's magazine "100 Best Values in Public Colleges in 2009." Mary Washington was also named as one of the Nation's best colleges and universities by the "Fiske Guide to Colleges" and is said to have "gained a reputation as one of the premium public liberal arts colleges in the country."

Last year, the University of Mary Washington celebrated their centennial anniversary. For over 100 years, the university has provided America's students with a quality education and opportunity. The institution's link to both history and innovation has provided students with the unique and irreplaceable learning environment.

I am happy to join my good friend and colleague, Representative WITTMAN, in congratulating the University of Mary Washington and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield to the gentleman who represents the First District of Virginia, who represents the University of Mary Washington, Mr. WITTMAN, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. WITTMAN. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 77, honoring the University of Mary Washington on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

On March 14, 1908, Virginia Governor Claude A. Swanson signed legislation that established what eventually became the University of Mary Wash-

ington. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the University of Mary Washington on its achievements over the past century.

Initially a small teaching college for women, the institution was renamed the University of Mary Washington in honor of Mary Ball Washington, the mother of President George Washington and a resident of the First District of Virginia. Currently, the University of Mary Washington has an enrollment of over 5,000 students, offers 43 degree programs, and consists of two campuses. The main campus is located in historic Fredericksburg, and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies is located in Stafford, Virginia.

The University of Mary Washington has been recognized nationally as a leading liberal arts college, and the U.S. News and World Report ranked its masters programs fourth among southern public schools.

The University of Mary Washington combines rich traditions with state-of-the-art technology to provide one of the best undergraduate liberal arts educations in the country. It also offers a variety of internships and study abroad programs that connect students locally, regionally, nationally and internationally.

I am pleased to recognize the important contributions made by the University of Mary Washington to the Fredericksburg region, the Commonwealth, and the Nation. I congratulate the University of Mary Washington as it celebrates its 100th anniversary, and I wish the university continued success in providing an outstanding education to the students of the Commonwealth and the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the University of Mary Washington by supporting House Resolution 77.

Mr. McKEON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 77.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

READ ACROSS AMERICA DAY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 146) designating March 2, 2009, as "Read Across America Day."

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 146

Whereas reading is a basic requirement for quality education and professional success, and is a source of pleasure throughout life;

Whereas the people of the United States must be able to read if the United States is to remain competitive in the global economy;

Whereas Congress, through the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110) and the Reading First, Early Reading First, and Improving Literacy Through School Libraries programs, has placed great emphasis on reading intervention and providing additional resources for reading assistance; and

Whereas more than 50 national organizations concerned about reading and education have joined with the National Education Association to use March 2 to celebrate reading and the birth of Theodor Geisel, also known as Dr. Seuss: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Theodor Geisel, also known as Dr. Seuss, for his success in encouraging children to discover the joy of reading;

(2) honors the 12th anniversary of Read Across America Day;

(3) encourages parents to read with their children for at least 30 minutes on Read Across America Day in honor of the commitment of the House of Representatives to building a Nation of readers; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 146 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 146, which recognizes March 2, 2009, as Read Across America Day and encourages parents to read to their children for at least 30 minutes in support of building a Nation of readers.

Read Across America Day was initiated in May of 1998 by the National Education Association as a way to celebrate reading. The NEA provides support to parents and teachers to keep their children reading all year long through activities such as the Cat-A-Van. The Cat-A-Van travels across the country bringing the gift of reading to school children. The Cat-A-Van donates 20,000 books to children in need.

The NEA celebrates Read Across America Day on Dr. Seuss' birthday every year to honor a man who contributed tremendously to children's literacy. Theodor Geisel, better known as Dr. Seuss by millions of children and

parents around the world, began writing children's books in 1936 and has since inspired millions of children to embrace the joys of reading through such favorites as "The Cat in the Hat," "Green Eggs and Ham," and "Oh the Places You'll Go."

We know from the research that children exposed to the nature and purpose of reading before kindergarten become more successful readers. We also know that a child who fails at reading is more likely to drop out of school.

If the United States is to stay competitive in a global economy, we must possess these basic requirements for a quality education and professional success. Encouraging children to read is one of the best tools we can equip our children with to help them become successful contributors to the United States.

I want to thank Representatives MARKEY and EHLERS for bringing this resolution forward, and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 146 designating March 2, 2009, as Read Across America Day. This celebration is held each year on the birthday of author Dr. Seuss. This year, Read Across America celebrates its 10th anniversary, and is also the 50th anniversary of Dr. Seuss' most recognizable work, "The Cat in the Hat."

Theodor Geisel, more famously known as Dr. Seuss, is the most beloved children's book author of all time. His use of rhyme makes his books an effective tool for teaching young children the basic skills they need to be successful and develop a lifelong love of reading. Celebrating Dr. Seuss and reading sends a clear message to our children that reading is both fun and important.

In 2001, Congress and President Bush highlighted the importance of reading by passing the No Child Left Behind Act. Through programs authorized under the act, the Federal Government demonstrated the importance of reading intervention in providing additional resources for reading assistance; most notable was its commitment to the Reading First Program. Once the program was implemented, the data quickly showed that Reading First works. On average, the 26 States with early baseline data on reading achievement increased the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficiency on fluency outcome measures. Among Wisconsin first graders, reading fluency proficiency increased by nearly 28 percent for economically disadvantaged students, more than 30 percent for limited English proficient students, nearly 22 percent for students with disabilities, more than 22 percent for African American students, and nearly 23 percent for Hispanic students.

States saw this improvement and made Reading First an integral oppo-

nent of their reform efforts. Reports by the Government Accountability Office, the Inspector General and the Center on Education Policy have all found widespread support for the program among the States. In one Center on Education Policy report, 97 percent of Reading First school districts said that the program was an important or very important cause for increases in students' reading scores.

Despite these positive results, the new majority has, over the course of 2 years, decreased funding levels by \$600 million in 2008 and completely eliminated funding for 2009. Individual States are beginning to voice their concern over the impact of lost Reading First funding. In fact, these cuts have led to such efforts as the Colorado State Board of Education passing a resolution expressing its support for Reading First model and its concern over the appropriations cut.

□ 1245

As we rightfully recognize another Read Across America Day, this Congress should begin the work of immediately restoring funding for this program that provides this Nation's most disadvantaged students the reading intervention and additional resources for reading assistance they so desperately need.

I thank my colleague from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) for sponsoring this resolution. And I ask that all of my colleagues support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlelady from my neighboring district in Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of House Resolution 146, which designates March 2, 2009, as "Read Across America Day," and to urge my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

Yesterday was the 105th anniversary of the birth of Theodor Seuss Geisel—or "Dr. Seuss," as he is better known to generations of children. Between 1937 and 1991, Dr. Seuss published more than 40 books. In fact, one in four American children receive Dr. Seuss as their first book.

It's hard to quantify the powerful investment in a child's future the simple act of reading can be. And as any parent will tell you, our most treasured memories of our children lie in the precious moments before bedtime, carefully making our way through books that we hope will capture our son or daughter's imagination and attention. In fact, reading together can serve as childhood's best mile marker as simple lessons of "Green Eggs and Ham" give way to the more complicated worlds of Nancy Drew and Harry Potter. It is as if a parent can see the very foundation of a child's mind take root and grow.

Dr. Seuss was one of the first to understand how a small spark of imagination early in life can lend itself in later years to great discovery and politics. "The Cat in the Hat" was originally commissioned in 1955 after it was found that children were being held back by boring books. Theodor Geisel introduced our kids to Marvin K. Mooney, to the Grinch, and to Cindy Lou Who, to Sam, who would not eat green eggs and ham, to the Yooks and the Zooks, who battled over which side of bread the butter is properly applied.

It is easy, in these times that we find ourselves in, to forget how important it is that simple lessons endure. Even in the midst of these times, parents must remember to read to their children. And we must remember that it is often the lessons found in children's literature that mean the most later in life. After all, C.S. Lewis told us in the *Chronicles of Narnia*, "For this is what it means to be king: to be the first in every desperate attack and last in every desperate retreat. And when there is hunger in the land (as must be now and then in bad years) to wear finer cloths and laugh louder over a scantier meal than any man in your land." And Dumbledore told us: "There are all kinds of courage. It takes a great deal of courage to stand up to our enemies, but just as much to stand up to our friends."

Behind all those who struggle to achieve and endure lies a parent or a teacher who took the time to attend to a child's earliest education. Some of the happiest moments in my life were spent cuddled up with Katie, Erin and Al—my three kids, who seem to be racing towards adulthood with uncommon speed—reading our favorite books. They are moments I would not trade for anything in the world.

So please vote "yes" on House Resolution 146 and remember the words of Dr. Seuss: "You have brains in your head. You have feet in your shoes. And you can steer yourself in any direction you choose. You're on your own. You know what you know. You're the guy who'll decide where you go."

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am in strong support of Resolution 146. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. It's saddening to me, though, that at this time, when we are talking about reading and the importance of reading, how an administration that is spending so freely will continue to cut funds from a program that works very well for our young people to give them the reading first opportunity that they so deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 146.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ON ITS 2009 ROSE BOWL VICTORY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 153) commending the University of Southern California Trojan football team for its victory in the 2009 Rose Bowl.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 153

Whereas the University of Southern California (USC) Trojan football team achieved many historic accomplishments during the 2008 regular season;

Whereas the USC Trojan football team has now won more Rose Bowls than any other team in the Nation;

Whereas USC has achieved its seventh straight top 5 finish;

Whereas USC achieved an unprecedented seventh consecutive season of at least 11 or more victories;

Whereas USC was invited to make an unprecedented seventh consecutive Bowl Championship Series appearance;

Whereas USC won an unprecedented seventh consecutive Pacific-10 (Pac-10) Conference championship;

Whereas USC has become the first school to win 3 consecutive Rose Bowls;

Whereas USC has appeared in a record-tying fourth consecutive Rose Bowl;

Whereas USC is now tied with the record for most bowl victories of all time;

Whereas USC has won 86 of its last 96 games;

Whereas with USC's 2009 Rose Bowl victory, the Pac-10 Conference finished a perfect 5 and 0 in post-season bowl appearances;

Whereas, during the 2008 season, USC's defense was ranked number one in the Nation, holding opponents to just over 221 yards per game;

Whereas, during the 2008 season, USC featured 3 All-American first team players (linebackers Rey Maualuga, Brian Cushing, and safety Taylor Mays);

Whereas USC will feature 5 players in the Under Armour Senior Bowl game held in Mobile, Alabama (linebackers Rey Maualuga, Brian Cushing, and Clay Matthews, and defensive linemen Fili Moala and Kyle Moore);

Whereas USC head football coach Pete Carroll is 88 and 15 (85.4 percent) in 8 years (2001 to 2008) as a college head coach at USC, his record is the best winning percentage of any current NCAA Division I coach with at least 5 years of experience;

Whereas Coach Pete Carroll was featured on CBS's "60 Minutes", not only for his football accomplishments but for his work with "A Better L.A.", a nonprofit group con-

sisting of a consortium of local agencies and organizations working to reduce gang violence by empowering change in individuals and communities;

Whereas, in the fall of 2008, Coach Pete Carroll helped organize "LA Live Peace 08", a march and rally at the Coliseum to promote gang intervention and non-violence in Los Angeles;

Whereas the annual Rose Bowl is the oldest of all college bowl games, and its history and prestige have earned it the title "The Granddaddy of Them All";

Whereas USC has played in the Rose Bowl on 33 occasions and won 24 times, both records exceeding any other collegiate football program;

Whereas, during the 2009 Rose Bowl game, quarterback Mark Sanchez passed for a game second-best 413 yards, a game record-tying 4 touchdown passes, and ran for a touchdown;

Whereas Sanchez's efforts resulted in him being named the Offensive Most Valuable Player of the game;

Whereas, during the 2009 Rose Bowl game, linebacker Kaluka Maiava made 4 tackles and 2 pass breakups, and he was named the Defensive Most Valuable Player of the game;

Whereas with linebacker Kaluka Maiava taking home Defensive MVP honors, each linebacker in USC's starting lineup has now been named defensive MVP of the Rose Bowl (Kaluka Maiava in 2009, Rey Maualuga in 2008, and Brian Cushing in 2007); and

Whereas, under the leadership of USC's 10th president, Steven B. Sample, USC has established itself as a world-class research university, known for its leadership in the fields of communication, media, public diplomacy, the sciences, and the arts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Southern California (USC) Trojan football team and USC President Steven B. Sample for USC's victory in the 2009 Rose Bowl;

(2) applauds Coach Pete Carroll for his leadership not only on the football field, but also in the community; and

(3) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, alumni, and staff who were instrumental in helping the University of Southern California win the Rose Bowl.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 153 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Southern California Trojan football team for their victory in the 2009 NCAA Rose Bowl game.

On January 1, the USC Trojans and the Penn State Lions squared off for an intense Rose Bowl football game. Defeating the tough Lions team by a score of 38-24, the USC Trojans won their third consecutive championship.

USC has played in a record-tying four consecutive Rose Bowls. And now, USC is tied for the most Bowl victories of all time at 31 victories. They have been to the Rose Bowl on 33 occasions and won 24 of those games.

Winning 86 of its last 96 games and finishing the season with an impressive 12-1 record, USC stands out as a premiere academic and athletic institution. They have won seven consecutive Pac-10 conference championships. With all the amazing teams across the country, USC sets themselves apart with their athletic success.

Congratulations are in order for Mark Sanchez, the game's Offensive Most Valuable Player. He threw for 413 yards and four touchdowns, and he still found a way to rush for one touchdown. He ran the offense flawlessly, with no interceptions, while posting 24 unanswered points in the second quarter, leading to a 38-24 victory.

Congratulations are also in order for Kaluka Maiava, the game's Defensive Most Valuable Player. Mr. Maiava made four tackles and two pass break-ups. As one of the three elite USC linebackers, Kaluka Maiava has led USC's number one ranked defense this entire season.

I want to extend my congratulations to head coach Pete Carroll. He has only brought success to this program; he took over 8 years ago. Coach Carroll has established an 88-15 win-loss record at USC—the best winning percentage of any current NCAA Division I coach with at least 5 years experience.

Besides coaching, Coach Carroll works with non-profit organizations to reduce gang violence in Los Angeles, California. His leadership and commitment to his team and city have brought him fame and a place in college football history.

The extraordinary achievement this year is a tribute to the skill and dedication of the many players, coaches, students, alumni, families and fans that have helped make the University of California a great football program. I know the fans of the University will revel in this accomplishment as they look forward to the 2009 season.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate the University of Southern California football team for their success. And I thank Congresswoman WATSON for bringing this resolution forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my two colleagues for allowing me this time, and I rise in strong support of H. Res. 153. This is the resolution that is honoring the University of Southern California—"USC," as we call it in my district—Trojan football team for their historic 2009 Rose Bowl victory.

During the 2008-2009 season, USC achieved several historic feats, with seven being the magic number. The Trojan football team finished the season with an unmatched seventh consecutive season with 11 or more vic-

tories. They appeared in an unprecedented seventh consecutive Bowl championship series game. Then the team won an unparalleled seventh consecutive Pac-10 title, and achieved a seven straight Top 5 finish.

USC defeated Penn State by a score of 38-24 in the 2009 Rose Bowl game, and I was there to witness it. With the win, USC became the first team to win three consecutive Rose Bowls. Also, USC has won now more Rose Bowls than any other collegiate football team in the Nation. They are now tied for the record for the most Bowl victories of all time.

USC's coach, Pete Carroll, completed yet another successful season. Since becoming head football coach in 2001, Carroll is 88 and 15, an average 85.4 percent win. Coach Carroll's winning percentage is the best among any NCAA Division I coach with at least 5 years of experience.

USC's quarterback, Mark Sanchez, threw for 413 yards and a record-tying four touchdown passes. For his performance, Sanchez was named the Offensive Most Valuable Player of the game.

USC's linebacker, Kaluka Maiava, made four tackles and two pass break-ups. For his performance, Maiava was named the Defensive Most Valuable Player of the game.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 153. Let's recognize the achievements of the players, the coaches, the students, the alumni and staff who were instrumental in helping USC win the 2009 Rose Bowl.

□ 1300

I would like to thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 153, commending the University of Southern California Trojan football team for its victory in the 2009 Rose Bowl.

The USC Trojan football team achieved many historic accomplishments during the 2008 regular season but few as meaningful as its victory in the 2009 Rose Bowl. With this victory the USC Trojans have now won more Rose Bowls than any other team in the Nation.

Known as "The Granddaddy of Them All," the Rose Bowl game kicked off a myriad of college football legacies in 1902. Since then the game has showcased 18 Heisman Trophy winners, produced 28 national champions, featured 197 consensus All-Americans, and honored 95 college football legends by inducting them into the Rose Bowl Hall of Fame.

At the conclusion of the 2008 season, USC's football team has won seven straight conference championships and played in seven consecutive BCS bowls, both NCAA records. They are 6-1 in those big games, 5-0 against Big Ten teams such as Penn State, and 82-9 since the beginning of the 2002 season.

They have also won 11 or more games in seven straight seasons, another record, and have played in four straight Rose Bowls, winning three.

The success of this team can be directly attributed to the vision of its head coach, Pete Carroll. Coach Carroll brought big doses of experience, enthusiasm, and leadership in his quest to revive the USC football program when he was named the Trojans' head football coach on December 15, 2000. The 56-year-old Carroll has 33 years of NFL and college experience, including 15 on the college level. Under Carroll USC is the first school to have three Heisman Trophy winners in a 4-year span. In addition, Coach Carroll has produced 30 All-American first teamers and 42 NFL draft picks, and his last six recruiting classes have been ranked in the top 10 nationally.

While the tradition of excellence certainly presents itself on the gridiron, the University of Southern California's commitment to academic excellence is equally abundant. Located in Los Angeles, Ms. WATSON's district, a global center for arts, technology, and international trade, the University of Southern California is one of the world's leading private research universities. USC enrolls more international students than any other U.S. university and offers extensive opportunities for internships and study abroad. With a strong tradition of integrating liberal and professional education, USC fosters a vibrant culture of public service and encourages students to cross academic and geographic boundaries in their pursuit of knowledge.

I extend my congratulations to Head Coach Pete Carroll, all of the hard-working players, the fans, and to the University of Southern California. I'm happy to join my good friend and colleague Representative DIANE WATSON in honoring this exceptional team for all its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 153.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1531

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 146, de novo;

H.R. 548, de novo;

H. Res. 77, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings will resume on H. Res. 146 and H. Res. 153 tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND WAR OF 1812 BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 146, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 146, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 13, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—394

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Abercrombie | Barton (TX) | Bonner |
| Ackerman | Bean | Bono Mack |
| Aderholt | Becerra | Boozman |
| Adler (NJ) | Berkley | Boren |
| Akin | Berman | Boswell |
| Alexander | Berry | Boucher |
| Altmire | Biggert | Boustany |
| Andrews | Bilbray | Boyd |
| Arcuri | Bilirakis | Brady (PA) |
| Austria | Bishop (GA) | Brady (TX) |
| Bachmann | Bishop (NY) | Braley (IA) |
| Bachus | Bishop (UT) | Bright |
| Baird | Blackburn | Brown (SC) |
| Baldwin | Blumenauer | Brown-Waite, |
| Barrett (SC) | Blunt | Ginny |
| Barrow | Boccieri | Burgess |
| Bartlett | Boehner | Burton (IN) |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Butterfield | Harper | Meek (FL) | Smith (NE) | Thompson (PA) | Watson |
| Buyer | Hastings (FL) | Meeks (NY) | Smith (NJ) | Thornberry | Watt |
| Calvert | Hastings (WA) | Melancon | Smith (TX) | Tiberi | Waxman |
| Camp | Heinrich | Mica | Smith (WA) | Tierney | Weiner |
| Cantor | Heller | Michaud | Souder | Titus | Welch |
| Cao | Hensarling | Miller (FL) | Space | Tonko | Westmoreland |
| Capito | Herger | Miller (MI) | Spratt | Towns | Wexler |
| Capps | Herseth Sandlin | Miller (NC) | Stearns | Tsongas | Whitfield |
| Capuano | Higgins | Miller, George | Stupak | Turner | Wilson (OH) |
| Cardoza | Hill | Minnick | Sullivan | Upton | Wilson (SC) |
| Carnahan | Himes | Mitchell | Sutton | Van Hollen | Wittman |
| Carney | Hinchev | Mollohan | Tanner | Velázquez | Wolf |
| Carson (IN) | Hinojosa | Moore (KS) | Tauscher | Visclosky | Woolsey |
| Carter | Hirono | Moore (WI) | Taylor | Walden | Wu |
| Cassidy | Hodes | Moran (KS) | Teague | Walz | Yarmuth |
| Castle | Hoekstra | Moran (VA) | Terry | Wamp | Young (AK) |
| Castor (FL) | Holden | Murphy (CT) | Thompson (CA) | Wasserman | |
| Chandler | Holt | Murphy, Patrick | Thompson (MS) | Schultz | |
| Childers | Honda | Murphy, Tim | | | |
| Clay | Hoyer | Murtha | | | |
| Cleaver | Hunter | Myrick | | | |
| Clyburn | Inglis | Nadler (NY) | | | |
| Coble | Inslee | Napolitano | | | |
| Coffman (CO) | Israel | Neal (MA) | | | |
| Cohen | Issa | Neugebauer | | | |
| Cole | Jackson (IL) | Nunes | | | |
| Conaway | Jackson-Lee | Nye | | | |
| Connolly (VA) | (TX) | Oberstar | | | |
| Conyers | Johnson (IL) | Obey | | | |
| Cooper | Johnson, E. B. | Olson | | | |
| Costa | Johnson, Sam | Oliver | | | |
| Costello | Jones | Ortiz | | | |
| Courtney | Jordan (OH) | Pallone | | | |
| Crenshaw | Kagen | Pascarell | | | |
| Crowley | Kanjorski | Pastor (AZ) | | | |
| Cuellar | Kennedy | Paulsen | | | |
| Culberson | Kildee | Payne | | | |
| Cummings | Kilpatrick (MI) | Pence | | | |
| Dahlkemper | Kilroy | Perlmutter | | | |
| Davis (AL) | Kind | Peters | | | |
| Davis (CA) | King (NY) | Peterson | | | |
| Davis (IL) | Kingston | Petri | | | |
| Davis (KY) | Kirk | Pingree (ME) | | | |
| Davis (TN) | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Pitts | | | |
| Deal (GA) | Kissell | Platts | | | |
| DeFazio | Klein (FL) | Poe (TX) | | | |
| DeGette | Kline (MN) | Polis (CO) | | | |
| Delahunt | Kosmas | Pomeroy | | | |
| DeLauro | Kratovil | Posey | | | |
| Dent | Kucinich | Price (GA) | | | |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Lamborn | Price (NC) | | | |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Lance | Radanovich | | | |
| Dicks | Langevin | Rahall | | | |
| Dingell | Larsen (WA) | Rangel | | | |
| Doggett | Larson (CT) | Rehberg | | | |
| Donnelly (IN) | Latham | Reichert | | | |
| Doyle | LaTourette | Reyes | | | |
| Dreier | Latta | Rodriguez | | | |
| Driehaus | Lee (NY) | Roe (TN) | | | |
| Edwards (TX) | Levin | Rogers (AL) | | | |
| Ellsworth | Lewis (CA) | Rogers (KY) | | | |
| Emerson | Linder | Rogers (MI) | | | |
| Engel | Lipinski | Rooney | | | |
| Eshoo | LoBiondo | Roskam | | | |
| Etheridge | Loeb sack | Ross | | | |
| Fallin | Lofgren, Zoe | Rothman (NJ) | | | |
| Farr | Lowey | Roybal-Allard | | | |
| Fattah | Lucas | Ruppersberger | | | |
| Filner | Luetkemeyer | Rush | | | |
| Fleming | Luján | Ryan (OH) | | | |
| Forbes | Lungren, Daniel | Ryan (WI) | | | |
| Fortenberry | E. | Salazar | | | |
| Foster | Lynch | Sánchez, Linda | | | |
| Fox | Mack | T. | | | |
| Frank (MA) | Maffei | Sanchez, Loretta | | | |
| Frelinghuysen | Maloney | Sarbanes | | | |
| Gallely | Marchant | Scalise | | | |
| Garrett (NJ) | Markey (CO) | Schakowsky | | | |
| Gerlach | Markey (MA) | Schauer | | | |
| Giffords | Marshall | Schiff | | | |
| Gingrey (GA) | Massa | Schmidt | | | |
| Gohmert | Matheson | Schock | | | |
| Gonzalez | Matsui | Schrader | | | |
| Goodlatte | McCarthy (CA) | Schwartz | | | |
| Gordon (TN) | McCarthy (NY) | Scott (GA) | | | |
| Granger | McCaul | Scott (VA) | | | |
| Graves | McClintock | Sensenbrenner | | | |
| Grayson | McCollum | Serrano | | | |
| Green, Al | McCotter | Sessions | | | |
| Green, Gene | McDermott | Sestak | | | |
| Griffith | McGovern | Shea-Porter | | | |
| Grijalva | McHenry | Sherman | | | |
| Guthrie | McHugh | Shimkus | | | |
| Gutierrez | McIntyre | Shuler | | | |
| Hall (NY) | McKeon | Shuster | | | |
| Hall (TX) | McMahon | Simpson | | | |
| Halvorson | McMorris | Sires | | | |
| Hare | Rodgers | Skelton | | | |
| Harman | McNerney | Slaughter | | | |

NAYS—13

Broun (GA)
Chaffetz
Duncan
Flake
Franks (AZ)

Jenkins
Lummis
Manzullo
Paul
Rohrabacher

Royce
Shadegg
Tiahrt

NOT VOTING—24

Baca
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Campbell
Clarke
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison

Fudge
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
King (IA)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Miller, Gary
Perriello

Putnam
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Snyder
Speier
Stark
Waters
Young (FL)

□ 1559

Ms. JENKINS and Messrs. TIAHRT, DUNCAN, FRANKS of Arizona, ROYCE, and ROHRBACHER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program for the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 91, I was not present because of the birth of my grandson. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELD PRESERVATION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 548, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 548, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 13, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—402

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie | Dahlkemper | Jackson-Lee |
| Ackerman | Davis (AL) | (TX) |
| Aderholt | Davis (CA) | Johnson (GA) |
| Adler (NJ) | Davis (IL) | Johnson (IL) |
| Akin | Davis (KY) | Johnson, E. B. |
| Alexander | Davis (TN) | Johnson, Sam |
| Altmire | Deal (GA) | Jones |
| Andrews | DeFazio | Jordan (OH) |
| Arcuri | DeGette | Kagen |
| Austria | Delahunt | Kanjorski |
| Bachmann | DeLauro | Kaptur |
| Bachus | Dent | Kennedy |
| Baird | Diaz-Balart, L. | Kildee |
| Baldwin | Diaz-Balart, M. | Kilpatrick (MI) |
| Barrett (SC) | Dicks | Kilroy |
| Barrow | Dingell | Kind |
| Bartlett | Doggett | King (NY) |
| Barton (TX) | Donnelly (IN) | Kingston |
| Bean | Doyle | Kirk |
| Becerra | Dreier | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Berkley | Driehaus | Kissell |
| Berman | Edwards (MD) | Klein (FL) |
| Berry | Edwards (TX) | Kline (MN) |
| Biggert | Ellsworth | Kosmas |
| Bilbray | Emerson | Kratovil |
| Bilirakis | Engel | Kucinich |
| Bishop (GA) | Eshoo | Lamborn |
| Bishop (NY) | Etheridge | Lance |
| Bishop (UT) | Fallin | Langevin |
| Blackburn | Farr | Larsen (WA) |
| Blumenauer | Fattah | Larsen (CT) |
| Blunt | Filner | Latham |
| Bocciari | LaTourette | Latta |
| Boehner | Fleming | Lee (CA) |
| Bonner | Forbes | Lee (NY) |
| Bono Mack | Fortenberry | Levin |
| Boozman | Foster | Lewis (CA) |
| Boren | Fox | Lewis (GA) |
| Boswell | Frank (MA) | Linder |
| Boucher | Frelinghuysen | Lipinski |
| Boustany | Fudge | LoBiondo |
| Boyd | Gallely | Loebsack |
| Brady (PA) | Garrett (NJ) | Lofgren, Zoe |
| Brady (TX) | Gerlach | Lowe |
| Braley (IA) | Giffords | Lucas |
| Bright | Gingrey (GA) | Luetkemeyer |
| Brown (SC) | Gohmert | Lujan |
| Brown-Waite, | Gonzalez | Lungren, Daniel |
| Ginny | Goodlatte | E. |
| Burgess | Gordon (TN) | Lynch |
| Burton (IN) | Granger | McCollum |
| Butterfield | Graves | McCotter |
| Buyer | Grayson | McDermott |
| Calvert | Green, Al | McGovern |
| Camp | Green, Gene | McHenry |
| Cantor | Griffith | McHugh |
| Cao | Grijalva | McIntyre |
| Capito | Guthrie | McKeon |
| Capps | Gutierrez | McMahon |
| Capuano | Hall (NY) | McMorris |
| Cardoza | Hall (TX) | Rodgers |
| Carnahan | Halvorson | McNerney |
| Carney | Hare | Meek (FL) |
| Carson (IN) | Harman | Meeks (NY) |
| Carter | Harper | Melancon |
| Cassidy | Hastings (FL) | Mica |
| Castle | Hastings (WA) | Michaud |
| Castor (FL) | Heinrich | Miller (FL) |
| Chandler | Heller | Miller (MI) |
| Childers | Hensarling | Miller (NC) |
| Clarke | Herger | Miller, George |
| Clay | Herseth Sandlin | Minnick |
| Cleaver | Higgins | Mitchell |
| Clyburn | Hill | Mollohan |
| Coble | Himes | Moore (KS) |
| Coffman (CO) | Hinche | |
| Cohen | Hinojosa | |
| Cole | Hirono | |
| Conaway | Hodes | |
| Connolly (VA) | Hoekstra | |
| Conyers | Holden | |
| Cooper | Holt | |
| Costa | Honda | |
| Costello | Hoyer | |
| Courtney | Hunter | |
| Crenshaw | Inglis | |
| Crowley | Inslee | |
| Cuellar | Isaiah | |
| Culberson | Issa | |
| Cummings | Jackson (IL) | |

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Moore (WI) | Rogers (KY) | Stupak |
| Moran (KS) | Rogers (MI) | Sullivan |
| Moran (VA) | Rooney | Sutton |
| Murphy (CT) | Roskam | Tanner |
| Murphy, Patrick | Ross | Tauscher |
| Murphy, Tim | Rothman (NJ) | Taylor |
| Murtha | Roybal-Allard | Teague |
| Myrick | Salazar | Terry |
| Nadler (NY) | Ruppersberger | Thompson (CA) |
| Napolitano | Rush | Thompson (MS) |
| Neal (MA) | Ryan (OH) | Thompson (PA) |
| Neugebauer | Ryan (WI) | Thornberry |
| Nunes | Salazar | Tiberi |
| Nye | Sánchez, Linda | Tierney |
| Oberstar | T. | Titus |
| Obey | Sanchez, Loretta | Tonko |
| Olson | Sarbanes | Towns |
| Olver | Scalise | Tsongas |
| Ortiz | Schakowsky | Turner |
| Pallone | Schauer | Upton |
| Pascarell | Schiff | Van Hollen |
| Pastor (AZ) | Schmidt | Velázquez |
| Paulsen | Schrock | Visclosky |
| Payne | Schrader | Walden |
| Pence | Schwartz | Walz |
| Peters | Scott (GA) | Wamp |
| Peterson | Scott (VA) | Wasserman |
| Petri | Sensenbrenner | Schultz |
| Pingree (ME) | Serrano | Waters |
| Pitts | Sessions | Watson |
| Platts | Sestak | Watt |
| Poe (TX) | Shea-Porter | Waxman |
| Polis (CO) | Sherman | Weiner |
| Pomeroy | Shimkus | Welch |
| Posey | Shuler | Westmoreland |
| Price (GA) | Shuster | Wexler |
| Price (NC) | Simpson | Whitfield |
| Radonovich | Sires | Wilson (OH) |
| Rahall | Skeltan | Wilson (SC) |
| Rangel | Slaughter | Wittman |
| Rehberg | Smith (NE) | Wolf |
| Reichert | Smith (NJ) | Woolsey |
| Reyes | Smith (TX) | Wu |
| Richardson | Smith (WA) | Yarmuth |
| Rodriguez | Souder | Young (AK) |
| Roe (TN) | Space | |
| Rogers (AL) | Spratt | |
| | Stearns | |

NAYS—13

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| Broun (GA) | Jenkins |
| Chaffetz | Lummis |
| Duncan | Manzullo |
| Flake | Paul |
| Franks (AZ) | Rohrabacher |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Baca | King (IA) | Snyder |
| Brown, Corrine | Miller, Gary | Speier |
| Buchanan | Perlmutter | Stark |
| Campbell | Perriello | Young (FL) |
| Ehlers | Putnam | |
| Ellison | Ros-Lehtinen | |

□ 1609

Mrs. MALONEY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 92, I was not present because of the birth of my grandson. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 92, I was unavoidably detained; otherwise I would have voted “yes” on the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 77, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 77.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—414

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie | Connolly (VA) | Heller |
| Ackerman | Conyers | Hensarling |
| Aderholt | Cooper | Herger |
| Adler (NJ) | Costa | Herseth Sandlin |
| Akin | Costello | Higgins |
| Alexander | Courtney | Hill |
| Altmire | Crenshaw | Himes |
| Andrews | Crowley | Hinche |
| Arcuri | Cuellar | Hinojosa |
| Austria | Culberson | Hirono |
| Bachmann | Cummings | Hodes |
| Bachus | Dahlkemper | Hoekstra |
| Baird | Davis (AL) | Holden |
| Baldwin | Davis (CA) | Holt |
| Barrett (SC) | Davis (IL) | Honda |
| Barrow | Davis (KY) | Hoyer |
| Bartlett | Davis (TN) | Hunter |
| Barton (TX) | Deal (GA) | Inglis |
| Bean | DeFazio | Inslee |
| Becerra | DeGette | Israel |
| Berkley | Delahunt | Issa |
| Berman | DeLauro | Jackson (IL) |
| Berry | Dent | Jackson-Lee |
| Biggert | Diaz-Balart, L. | (TX) |
| Bilbray | Diaz-Balart, M. | Jenkins |
| Bilirakis | Dicks | Johnson (GA) |
| Bishop (GA) | Dingell | Johnson (IL) |
| Bishop (NY) | Doggett | Johnson, E. B. |
| Bishop (UT) | Donnelly (IN) | Johnson, Sam |
| Blackburn | Doyle | Jones |
| Blumenauer | Dreier | Jordan (OH) |
| Blunt | Driehaus | Kagen |
| Bocciari | Duncan | Kanjorski |
| Boehner | Edwards (MD) | Kaptur |
| Bonner | Edwards (TX) | Kennedy |
| Bono Mack | Ellsworth | Kildee |
| Boozman | Emerson | Kilpatrick (MI) |
| Boren | Engel | Kilroy |
| Boswell | Eshoo | Kind |
| Boucher | Etheridge | King (NY) |
| Boustany | Fallin | Kingston |
| Boyd | Farr | Kirk |
| Brady (PA) | Fattah | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Brady (TX) | Filner | Kissell |
| Braley (IA) | Flake | Klein (FL) |
| Bright | Fleming | Kline (MN) |
| Broun (GA) | Forbes | Kosmas |
| Brown (SC) | Fortenberry | Kratovil |
| Brown-Waite, | Foster | Kucinich |
| Ginny | Fox | Lamborn |
| Burgess | Frank (MA) | Lance |
| Burton (IN) | Franks (AZ) | Langevin |
| Butterfield | Frelinghuysen | Larsen (WA) |
| Buyer | Fudge | Larsen (CT) |
| Calvert | Gallely | Latham |
| Camp | Garrett (NJ) | LaTourette |
| Cantor | Gerlach | Latta |
| Cao | Giffords | Lee (CA) |
| Capito | Gingrey (GA) | Lee (NY) |
| Capps | Gohmert | Levin |
| Capuano | Gonzalez | Lewis (CA) |
| Cardoza | Goodlatte | Lewis (GA) |
| Carnahan | Gordon (TN) | Linder |
| Carney | Granger | Lipinski |
| Carson (IN) | Graves | LoBiondo |
| Carter | Grayson | Loebsack |
| Cassidy | Green, Al | Lofgren, Zoe |
| Castle | Green, Gene | Lowe |
| Castor (FL) | Griffith | Lucas |
| Chaffetz | Grijalva | Luetkemeyer |
| Chandler | Guthrie | Lujan |
| Childers | Gutierrez | Lummis |
| Clarke | Hall (NY) | Lungren, Daniel |
| Clay | Hall (TX) | E. |
| Cleaver | Halvorson | Lynch |
| Clyburn | Hare | Mack |
| Coble | Harman | Maffei |
| Coffman (CO) | Harper | Maloney |
| Cohen | Hastings (FL) | Manzullo |
| Cole | Hastings (WA) | Marchant |
| Conaway | Heinrich | Markey (CO) |

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Markey (MA) | Perlmutter | Shuler |
| Marshall | Peters | Shuster |
| Massa | Peterson | Simpson |
| Matheson | Petri | Sires |
| Matsui | Pingree (ME) | Skelton |
| McCarthy (CA) | Pitts | Slaughter |
| McCarthy (NY) | Platts | Smith (NE) |
| McCaul | Poe (TX) | Smith (NJ) |
| McClintock | Polis (CO) | Smith (TX) |
| McCollum | Pomeroy | Smith (WA) |
| McCotter | Posey | Souder |
| McDermott | Price (GA) | Space |
| McGovern | Price (NC) | Spratt |
| McHugh | Radanovich | Stearns |
| McIntyre | Rahall | Stupak |
| McKeon | Rangel | Sullivan |
| McMahon | Rehberg | Sutton |
| McMorris | Reichert | Tanner |
| Rodgers | Reyes | Tauscher |
| McNerney | Richardson | Taylor |
| Meek (FL) | Rodriguez | Teague |
| Meeks (NY) | Roe (TN) | Terry |
| Melancon | Rogers (AL) | Thompson (CA) |
| Mica | Rogers (KY) | Thompson (MS) |
| Michaud | Rogers (MI) | Thompson (PA) |
| Miller (FL) | Rohrabacher | Thornberry |
| Miller (MI) | Rooney | Tiahrt |
| Miller (NC) | Roskam | Tiberi |
| Miller, George | Ross | Tierney |
| Minnick | Rothman (NJ) | Titus |
| Mitchell | Roybal-Allard | Tonko |
| Mollohan | Royce | Towns |
| Moore (KS) | Ruppersberger | Tsongas |
| Moore (WI) | Rush | Turner |
| Moran (KS) | Ryan (OH) | Upton |
| Moran (VA) | Ryan (WI) | Van Hollen |
| Murphy (CT) | Salazar | Velázquez |
| Murphy, Patrick | Sánchez, Linda | Visclosky |
| Murphy, Tim | T. | Walden |
| Murtha | Sanchez, Loretta | Walz |
| Myrick | Sarbanes | Wamp |
| Nadler (NY) | Scalise | Wasserman |
| Napolitano | Schakowsky | Schultz |
| Neal (MA) | Schauer | Waters |
| Neugebauer | Schiff | Watson |
| Nunes | Schmidt | Watt |
| Nye | Schock | Waxman |
| Oberstar | Schrader | Weiner |
| Obey | Schwartz | Welch |
| Olson | Scott (GA) | Westmoreland |
| Olver | Scott (VA) | Wexler |
| Ortiz | Sensenbrenner | Whitfield |
| Pallone | Serrano | Wilson (SC) |
| Pascrell | Sessions | Wittman |
| Pastor (AZ) | Sestak | Wolf |
| Paul | Shadegg | Woolsey |
| Paulsen | Shea-Porter | Wu |
| Payne | Sherman | Yarmuth |
| Pence | Shimkus | Young (AK) |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| Baca | King (IA) | Snyder |
| Brown, Corrine | McHenry | Speier |
| Buchanan | Miller, Gary | Stark |
| Campbell | Perriello | Wilson (OH) |
| Ehlers | Putnam | Young (FL) |
| Ellison | Ros-Lehtinen | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to record their votes.

□ 1616

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on roll-call No. 93, I was not present because of the birth of my grandson. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby

notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that "a top defense-lobbying firm" that "specializes in obtaining earmarks in the defense budget for a long list of clients" was "recently raided by the FBI.":

Whereas Roll Call reported on February 11, 2009, that "the defense-appropriations-focused lobbying shop" had in recent years "spread millions of dollars of campaign contributions to lawmakers.":

Whereas Politico reported on February 13, 2009, that "federal investigators are asking about thousands of dollars in campaign contributions to lawmakers as part of an effort to determine whether they were illegal 'straw man' donations.":

Whereas Roll Call reported on February 20, 2009, that they have "located tens of thousands of dollars worth of [the raided firm]-linked donations that are improperly reported in the FEC database.":

Whereas Roll Call also reported that "tracking Federal Election Commission records of campaign donations attributed to [the firm] is a comedy of errors, misinformation and mysteries, providing more questions than answers about how much money the lobbying firm actually raised for Congressional campaigns.":

Whereas CQ Today reported on February 19, 2009, that "104 House members got earmarks for projects sought by [clients of the firm] in the 2008 defense appropriations bills," and that 87 percent of this bipartisan group of Members received campaign contributions from the raided firm;

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that in 2008 clients of this firm had "received \$299 million worth of earmarks, according to Taxpayers for Common Sense.":

Whereas The Hill reported on February 23, 2009, that "clients of a defense lobby shop under investigation are continuing to score earmarks from their patrons in Congress, despite the firm being on the verge of shutting its doors permanently" and that several of the firm's clients "are slated to receive earmarks worth at least \$8 million in the omnibus spending bill funding the federal government through the rest of fiscal 2009 . . .":

Whereas the Washington Post reported on June 13, 2008, in a story describing increased earmark spending in the House version of the fiscal year 2009 defense authorization bill that "many of the earmarks serve as no-bid contracts for the recipients.":

Whereas the Associated Press reported on February 25, 2009, that "the Justice Department's fraud section is overseeing an investigation into whether [the firm] reimbursed some employees for campaign contributions to members of Congress who requested the projects.":

Whereas Politico reported on February 12, 2009, that "several sources said FBI agents have spent months laying the groundwork for their current investigation, including conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions.":

Whereas the reportedly fraudulent nature of campaign contributions originating from the raided firm, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of congressional proceedings and the dignity of the institution; and

Whereas the fact that cases are being investigated by the Justice Department does not preclude the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from taking investigative steps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or an investigative subcommittee of the committee established jointly by the chair and ranking minority member shall immediately begin an investigation into the relationship between earmark requests on behalf of clients of the raided firm already made by Members and the source and timing of past campaign contributions related to such requests.

(b) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall submit a report of its findings to the House of Representatives within 2 months after the date of adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

NAMING MEMBERS TO BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ON INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker named the following Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 111th Congress:

Ms. BALDWIN, Wisconsin
Mr. CARNAHAN, Missouri
Mr. CLEAVER, Missouri
Mrs. DAVIS, California
Mr. ELLISON, Minnesota
Mr. GONZALEZ, Texas
Ms. HIRONO, Hawaii
Mr. MILLER, North Carolina

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I designate the following Members to be available for service on the investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct during the 111th Congress:

The Honorable Rob Bishop of Utah.

The Honorable Marsha Blackburn of Tennessee.

The Honorable Ander Crenshaw of Florida.
The Honorable Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida.

The Honorable Tom Latham of Iowa.
The Honorable Frank Lucas of Oklahoma.
The Honorable Sue Myrick of North Carolina.

The Honorable Mike Simpson of Idaho.
The Honorable Greg Walden of Oregon.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

COMMEMORATING TEXAS' INDEPENDENCE AND WELCOMING A NEW TEXAN

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark two important occasions.

One hundred seventy-three years ago yesterday, March, 2, 1836, Texas declared its independence from Mexico. We celebrate this declaration of freedom from tyranny knowing that during the same time in 1836 the Alamo was under attack by the Army of Mexico's dictator, Santa Anna, and would fall after 13 days of resistance. As Texans and Americans, we honor freedom and those who protect it.

I also want to celebrate the birth of a new Texan, our fourth grandchild, Tristan Michael Green, born February 11, 2009 to our son and our daughter-in-law, Chris and Brandy Green. Tristan was born at 10:37 a.m. at 18¾ inches and weighing 6 pounds, 4 ounces. He is healthy and eating constantly.

We welcome another Texan to join his big brother, Dylan. God bless Texas and the United States of America.

FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS WILL BENEFIT THE MOST FROM SO-CALLED STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, a few days ago, just before we voted on the so-called stimulus package, The Washington Post said in a story that it would mean a "massive financial windfall for Federal agencies." The Post was for the bill, but those were the words the paper used, "massive financial windfall for Federal agencies."

Then on the front page of today's Washington Post is a story saying, "Tens of thousands could be added to Federal payroll" under the President's budget. The story says, "President Obama's budget is so ambitious with vast new spending that experts say he will need to hire tens of thousands of new Federal Government workers."

All over the country, people think they are going to get stimulus money or checks from all this spending, yet the ones who will benefit the most are those who need it the least—Federal bureaucrats. Very little, Madam

Speaker, is going to trickle down to the rest of the country.

□ 1630

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT 111TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I submit for publication the attached copy of the Rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct the U.S. House of Representatives for the 111th Congress. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct adopted these rules pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(1) on February 10, 2009. I am submitting these rules for publication in compliance with House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(2). The Committee is reviewing its rules and will make revisions to conform with House rules pertaining to the Office of Congressional Ethics. The revised rules will be submitted for publication after they are adopted by the Committee.

FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help ensure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 111th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have access to such information that they request as necessary to conduct Committee business.

RULE 2. DEFINITIONS

(a) "Committee" means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(b) "Complaint" means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) "Inquiry" means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) "Investigative Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 19(a) to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(e) "Statement of Alleged Violation" means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(f) "Adjudicatory Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 23(a) that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(g) "Sanction Hearing" means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(h) "Respondent" means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of an inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(i) "Office of Advice and Education" refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(j) "Member" means a Representative in, or a Delegate to, or the Resident Commissioner to, the U.S. House of Representatives.

RULE 3. ADVISORY OPINIONS AND WAIVERS

(a) The Office of Advice and Education shall handle inquiries; prepare written opinions providing specific advice; develop general guidance; and organize seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(b) Any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives may request a written opinion with respect to the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of such Member, officer, or employee.

(c) The Office of Advice and Education may provide information and guidance regarding laws, rules, regulations, and other standards of conduct applicable to Members, officers, and employees in the performance of their duties or the discharge of their responsibilities.

(d) In general, the Committee shall provide a written opinion to an individual only in response to a written request, and the written opinion shall address the conduct only of the inquiring individual, or of persons for whom the inquiring individual is responsible as employing authority.

(e) A written request for an opinion shall be addressed to the Chair of the Committee and shall include a complete and accurate statement of the relevant facts. A request shall be signed by the requester or the requester's authorized representative or employing authority. A representative shall disclose to the Committee the identity of the principal on whose behalf advice is being sought.

(f) The Office of Advice and Education shall prepare for the Committee a response to each written request for an opinion from a Member, officer, or employee. Each response shall discuss all applicable laws, rules, regulations, or other standards.

(g) Where a request is unclear or incomplete, the Office of Advice and Education may seek additional information from the requester.

(h) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to take action on behalf of the Committee on any proposed written opinion that they determine does not require consideration by the Committee. If the Chair or Ranking Minority Member requests a written opinion, or seeks a waiver, extension, or approval pursuant to Rules 3(1), 4(c), 4(e), or 4(h), the next ranking member of the requester's party is authorized to act in lieu of the requester.

(i) The Committee shall keep confidential any request for advice from a Member, officer, or employee, as well as any response thereto.

(j) The Committee may take no adverse action in regard to any conduct that has been undertaken in reliance on a written opinion if the conduct conforms to the specific facts addressed in the opinion.

(k) Information provided to the Committee by a Member, officer, or employee seeking advice regarding prospective conduct may not be used as the basis for initiating an investigation under clause 3(a)(2) or clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, if such Member, officer, or employee acts in good faith in accordance with the written advice of the Committee.

(l) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule), or for any other waiver or approval, shall be treated in all respects like any other request for a written opinion.

(m) A written request for a waiver of clause 5 of House Rule XXV (the House gift rule) shall specify the nature of the waiver being sought and the specific circumstances justifying the waiver.

(n) An employee seeking a waiver of time limits applicable to travel paid for by a private source shall include with the request evidence that the employing authority is aware of the request. In any other instance where proposed employee conduct may reflect on the performance of official duties, the Committee may require that the requester submit evidence that the employing authority knows of the conduct.

RULE 4. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

(a) In matters relating to Title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Committee shall coordinate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Legislative Resource Center, to assure that appropriate individuals are notified of their obligation to file Financial Disclosure Statements and that such individuals are provided in a timely fashion with filing instructions and forms developed by the Committee.

(b) The Committee shall coordinate with the Legislative Resource Center to assure that information that the Ethics in Government Act requires to be placed on the public record is made public.

(c) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to grant on behalf of the Committee requests for reasonable extensions of time for the filing of Financial Disclosure Statements. Any such request must be received by the Committee no later than the date on which the Statement in question is due. A request received after such date may be granted by the Committee only in extraordinary circumstances. Such extensions for one individual in a calendar year shall not exceed a total of 90 days. No exten-

sion shall be granted authorizing a non-incumbent candidate to file a statement later than 30 days prior to a primary or general election in which the candidate is participating.

(d) An individual who takes legally sufficient action to withdraw as a candidate before the date on which that individual's Financial Disclosure Statement is due under the Ethics in Government Act shall not be required to file a Statement. An individual shall not be excused from filing a Financial Disclosure Statement when withdrawal as a candidate occurs after the date on which such Statement was due.

(e) Any individual who files a report required to be filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act more than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the date such report is required to be filed, or

(2) if a filing extension is granted to such individual, the last day of the filing extension period, is required by such Act to pay a late filing fee of \$200. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests that the fee be waived based on extraordinary circumstances.

(f) Any late report that is submitted without a required filing fee shall be deemed procedurally deficient and not properly filed.

(g) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve requests for waivers of the aggregation and reporting of gifts as provided by section 102(a)(2)(C) of the Ethics in Government Act. If such a request is approved, both the incoming request and the Committee response shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for placement on the public record.

(h) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member are authorized to approve blind trusts as qualifying under section 102(0)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act. The correspondence relating to formal approval of a blind trust, the trust document, the list of assets transferred to the trust, and any other documents required by law to be made public, shall be forwarded to the Legislative Resource Center for such purpose.

(i) The Committee shall designate staff counsel who shall review Financial Disclosure Statements and, based upon information contained therein, indicate in a form and manner prescribed by the Committee whether the Statement appears substantially accurate and complete and the filer appears to be in compliance with applicable laws and rules.

(j) Each Financial Disclosure Statement shall be reviewed within 60 days after the date of filing.

(k) If the reviewing counsel believes that additional information is required because (1) the Statement appears not substantially accurate or complete, or (2) the filer may not be in compliance with applicable laws or rules, then the reporting individual shall be notified in writing of the additional information believed to be required, or of the law or rule with which the reporting individual does not appear to be in compliance. Such notice shall also state the time within which a response is to be submitted. Any such notice shall remain confidential.

(l) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (c), a reporting individual who concurs with the Committee's notification that the Statement is not complete, or that other action is required, shall submit the necessary information or take appropriate action. Any amendment may be in the form of a revised Financial Disclosure Statement or an explanatory letter addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(m) Any amendment shall be placed on the public record in the same manner as other

Statements. The individual designated by the Committee to review the original Statement shall review any amendment thereto.

(n) Within the time specified, including any extension granted in accordance with clause (c), a reporting individual who does not agree with the Committee that the Statement is deficient or that other action is required, shall be provided an opportunity to respond orally or in writing. If the explanation is accepted, a copy of the response, if written, or a note summarizing an oral response, shall be retained in Committee files with the original report.

(o) The Committee shall be the final arbiter of whether any Statement requires clarification or amendment.

(p) If the Committee determines, by vote of a majority of its members, that there is reason to believe that an individual has willfully failed to file a Statement or has willfully falsified or willfully failed to file information required to be reported, then the Committee shall refer the name of the individual, together with the evidence supporting its finding, to the Attorney General pursuant to section 104(b) of the Ethics in Government Act. Such referral shall not preclude the Committee from initiating such other action as may be authorized by other provisions of law or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 5. MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Tuesday of each month, except when the House of Representatives is not meeting on that day. When the Committee Chair determines that there is sufficient reason, meetings may be called on additional days. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held when the Chair determines there is no business to be considered.

(b) The Chair shall establish the agenda for meetings of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may place additional items on the agenda.

(c) All meetings of the Committee or any subcommittee shall occur in executive session unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, opens the meeting or hearing to the public.

(d) Any hearing held by an adjudicatory subcommittee or any sanction hearing held by the Committee shall be open to the public unless the Committee or subcommittee, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, closes the hearing to the public.

(e) A subcommittee shall meet at the discretion of its Chair.

(f) Insofar as practicable, notice for any Committee or subcommittee meeting shall be provided at least seven days in advance of the meeting. The Chair of the Committee or subcommittee may waive such time period for good cause.

RULE 6. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The staff is to be assembled and retained as a professional, nonpartisan staff.

(b) Each member of the staff shall be professional and demonstrably qualified for the position for which the individual is hired.

(c) The staff as a whole and each individual member of the staff shall perform all official duties in a nonpartisan manner.

(d) No member of the staff shall engage in any partisan political activity directly affecting any congressional or presidential election.

(e) No member of the staff or outside counsel may accept public speaking engagements or write for publication on any subject that is in any way related to the employment or duties with the Committee of such individual without specific prior approval from the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(f) All staff members shall be appointed by an affirmative vote of a majority of the

members of the Committee. Such vote shall occur at the first meeting of the membership of the Committee during each Congress and as necessary during the Congress.

(g) Subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration, the Committee may retain counsel not employed by the House of Representatives whenever the Committee determines, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, that the retention of outside counsel is necessary and appropriate.

(h) If the Committee determines that it is necessary to retain staff members for the purpose of a particular investigation or other proceeding, then such staff shall be retained only for the duration of that particular investigation or proceeding.

(i) Outside counsel may be dismissed prior to the end of a contract between the Committee and such counsel only by a majority vote of the members of the Committee.

(j) In addition to any other staff provided for by law, rule, or other authority, with respect to the Committee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member each may appoint one individual as a shared staff member from the respective personal staff of the Chair or Ranking Minority Member to perform service for the Committee. Such shared staff may assist the Chair or Ranking Minority Member on any subcommittee on which the Chair or Ranking Minority Member serves. Only paragraphs (c) and (e) of this Rule and Rule 7(b) shall apply to shared staff.

RULE 7. CONFIDENTIALITY

(a) Before any Member or employee of the Committee, including members of an investigative subcommittee selected under clause 5(a)(4) of Rule X of the House of Representatives and shared staff designated pursuant to Committee Rule 6(j), may have access to information that is confidential under the rules of the Committee, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed in writing:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose, to any person or entity outside the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, any information received in the course of my service with the Committee, except as authorized by the Committee or in accordance with its rules."

Copies of the executed oath shall be provided to the Clerk of the House as part of the records of the House. Breaches of confidentiality shall be investigated by the Committee and appropriate action shall be taken.

(b) No member of the staff or outside counsel may make public, unless approved by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, any information, document, or other material that is confidential, derived from executive session, or classified and that is obtained during the course of employment with the Committee.

(c) Committee members and staff shall not disclose any evidence relating to an investigation to any person or organization outside the Committee unless authorized by the Committee.

(d) Members and staff of the Committee shall not disclose to any person or organization outside the Committee, unless authorized by the Committee, any information regarding the Committee's or a subcommittee's investigative, adjudicatory or other proceedings, including but not limited to: (i) the fact or nature of any complaints; (ii) executive session proceedings; (iii) information pertaining to or copies of any Committee or subcommittee report, study or other document which purports to express the views, findings, conclusions or recommendations of the Committee or subcommittee in connection with any of its activities or proceedings; or (iv) any other information or allegation

respecting the conduct of a Member, officer or employee of the House.

(e) Except as otherwise specifically authorized by the Committee, no Committee member or staff member shall disclose to any person outside the Committee, the name of any witness subpoenaed to testify or to produce evidence.

(f) The Committee shall not disclose to any person or organization outside the Committee any information concerning the conduct of a respondent until it has transmitted a Statement of Alleged Violation to such respondent and the respondent has been given full opportunity to respond pursuant to Rule 22. The Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be made public at the first meeting or hearing on the matter that is open to the public after such opportunity has been provided. Any other materials in the possession of the Committee regarding such statement may be made public as authorized by the Committee to the extent consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. If no public hearing is held on the matter, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any written response thereto shall be included in the Committee's final report on the matter to the House of Representatives.

(g) Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the Committee, only the Chair or Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, after consultation with each other, may make public statements regarding matters before the Committee or any subcommittee.

(h) The Committee may establish procedures necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any testimony or other information received by the Committee or its staff.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES—GENERAL POLICY AND STRUCTURE

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of these Rules, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may consult with an investigative subcommittee either on their own initiative or on the initiative of the subcommittee, shall have access to evidence and information before a subcommittee with whom they so consult, and shall not thereby be precluded from serving as full, voting members of any adjudicatory subcommittee. Except for the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee pursuant to this paragraph, evidence in the possession of an investigative subcommittee shall not be disclosed to other Committee members except by a vote of the subcommittee.

(b) The Committee may establish other noninvestigative and nonadjudicatory subcommittees and may assign to them such functions as it may deem appropriate. The membership of each subcommittee shall provide equal representation for the majority and minority parties.

(c) The Chair may refer any bill, resolution, or other matter before the Committee to an appropriate subcommittee for consideration. Any such bill, resolution, or other matter may be discharged from the subcommittee to which it was referred by a majority vote of the Committee.

(d) Any member of the Committee may sit with any noninvestigative or nonadjudicatory subcommittee, but only regular members of such subcommittee may vote on any matter before that subcommittee.

RULE 9. QUORUMS AND MEMBER DISQUALIFICATION

(a) The quorum for an investigative subcommittee to take testimony and to receive evidence shall be two members, unless otherwise authorized by the House of Representatives.

(b) The quorum for an adjudicatory subcommittee to take testimony, receive evi-

dence, or conduct business shall consist of a majority plus one of the members of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(c) Except as stated in clauses (a) and (b) of this rule, a quorum for the purpose of conducting business consists of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee.

(d) A member of the Committee shall be ineligible to participate in any Committee or subcommittee proceeding in which such Member is the respondent.

(e) A member of the Committee may seek disqualification from participating in any investigation of the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives upon the submission in writing and under oath of an affidavit of disqualification stating that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. If the Committee approves and accepts such affidavit of disqualification, or if a member is disqualified pursuant to Rule 17(e) or Rule 23(a), the Chair shall so notify the Speaker and ask the Speaker to designate a Member of the House of Representatives from the same political party as the disqualified member of the Committee to act as a member of the Committee in any Committee proceeding relating to such investigation.

RULE 10. VOTE REQUIREMENTS

(a) The following actions shall be taken only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate:

(1) Issuing a subpoena.

(2) Adopting a full Committee motion to create an investigative subcommittee.

(3) Adopting or amending a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(4) Finding that a count in a Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(5) Sending a letter of reproof.

(6) Adopting a recommendation to the House of Representatives that a sanction be imposed.

(7) Adopting a report relating to the conduct of a Member, officer, or employee.

(8) Issuing an advisory opinion of general applicability establishing new policy.

(b) Except as stated in clause (a), action may be taken by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by a simple majority, a quorum being present.

(c) No motion made to take any of the actions enumerated in clause (a) of this Rule may be entertained by the Chair unless a quorum of the Committee is present when such motion is made.

RULE 11. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) All communications and all pleadings pursuant to these rules shall be filed with the Committee at the Committee's office or such other place as designated by the Committee.

(b) All records of the Committee which have been delivered to the Archivist of the United States shall be made available to the public in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. BROADCASTS OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

(a) Television or radio coverage of a Committee or subcommittee hearing or meeting shall be without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness shall be required against the witness' will to be photographed or otherwise to have a graphic reproduction of the witness' image made at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any witness, all media microphones shall be turned off, all television and camera lenses shall be covered, and the making of a graphic

reproduction at the hearing shall not be permitted. This paragraph supplements clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The Committee may allocate the positions of permitted television cameras among the television media in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee, or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions that unnecessarily obstruct the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

PART II—INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY

RULE 13. HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whenever the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation, the provisions of the resolution, in conjunction with these Rules, shall govern. To the extent the provisions of the resolution differ from these Rules, the resolution shall control.

RULE 14. COMMITTEE AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE—GENERAL POLICY

(a) Pursuant to clause 3(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee may exercise its investigative authority when:

(1) information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives is transmitted directly to the Committee;

(2) information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House is transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that such Member believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee;

(3) the Committee, on its own initiative, establishes an investigative subcommittee;

(4) a Member, officer, or employee is convicted in a Federal, State, or local court of a felony;

(5) the House of Representatives, by resolution, authorizes or directs the Committee to undertake an inquiry or investigation; or

(b) The Committee also has investigatory authority over:

(1) certain unauthorized disclosures of intelligence-related information, pursuant to House Rule X, clauses 11(g)(4) and (g)(5); or

(2) reports received from the Office of the Inspector General pursuant to House Rule II, clause 6(c)(5).

RULE 15. COMPLAINTS

(a) A complaint submitted to the Committee shall be in writing, dated, and properly verified (a document will be considered properly verified where a notary executes it with the language, "Signed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on (date) by (the name of the person)" setting forth in simple, concise, and direct statements—

(1) the name and legal address of the party filing the complaint (hereinafter referred to as the "complainant");

(2) the name and position or title of the respondent;

(3) the nature of the alleged violation of the Code of Official Conduct or of other law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities; and

(4) the facts alleged to give rise to the violation. The complaint shall not contain in-

nuendo, speculative assertions, or conclusory statements.

(b) Any documents in the possession of the complainant that relate to the allegations may be submitted with the complaint.

(c) Information offered as a complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives may be transmitted directly to the Committee.

(d) Information offered as a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House may be transmitted to the Committee, provided that a Member of the House certifies in writing that such Member believes the information is submitted in good faith and warrants the review and consideration of the Committee.

(e) A complaint must be accompanied by a certification, which may be unsworn, that the complainant has provided an exact copy of the filed complaint and all attachments to the respondent.

(f) The Committee may defer action on a complaint against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives when the complaint alleges conduct that the Committee has reason to believe is being reviewed by appropriate law enforcement or regulatory authorities, or when the Committee determines that it is appropriate for the conduct alleged in the complaint to be reviewed initially by law enforcement or regulatory authorities.

(g) A complaint may not be amended without leave of the Committee. Otherwise, any new allegations of improper conduct must be submitted in a new complaint that independently meets the procedural requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee's Rules.

(h) The Committee shall not accept, and shall return to the complainant, any complaint submitted within the 60 days prior to an election in which the subject of the complaint is a candidate.

(i) The Committee shall not consider a complaint, nor shall any investigation be undertaken by the Committee, of any alleged violation which occurred before the third previous Congress unless the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation which occurred in a more recent Congress.

RULE 16. DUTIES OF COMMITTEE CHAIR AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

(a) Whenever information offered as a complaint is submitted to the Committee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member shall have 14 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever occurs first, to determine whether the information meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint.

(b) Whenever the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, they shall have 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, after the date that the Chair and Ranking Minority Member determine that information filed meets the requirements of the Committee's rules for what constitutes a complaint, unless the Committee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members votes otherwise, to—

(1) recommend to the Committee that it dispose of the complaint, or any portion thereof, in any manner that does not require action by the House, which may include dismissal of the complaint or resolution of the complaint by a letter to the Member, officer, or employee of the House against whom the complaint is made;

(2) establish an investigative subcommittee; or

(3) request that the Committee extend the applicable 45-calendar day period when they

determine more time is necessary in order to make a recommendation under paragraph (1) or (2) of Rule 16(b).

(c) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning alleged conduct which is the basis of a complaint or of information offered as a complaint until they have established an investigative subcommittee or the Chair or Ranking Minority Member has placed on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee.

(d) If the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee meets the requirements of the Committee rules for what constitutes a complaint, and the complaint is not disposed of within 45 calendar days or 5 legislative days, whichever is later, and no additional 45-day extension is made, then they shall establish an investigative subcommittee and forward the complaint, or any portion thereof, to that subcommittee for its consideration. If at any time during the time period either the Chair or Ranking Minority Member places on the agenda the issue of whether to establish an investigative subcommittee, then an investigative subcommittee may be established only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(e) Whenever the Chair and Ranking Minority Member jointly determine that information submitted to the Committee does not meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee rules, they may (1) return the information to the complainant with a statement that it fails to meet the requirements for what constitutes a complaint set forth in the Committee's rules; or (2) recommend to the Committee that it authorize the establishment of an investigative subcommittee.

RULE 17. PROCESSING OF COMPLAINTS

(a) If a complaint is in compliance with House and Committee Rules, a copy of the complaint and the Committee Rules shall be forwarded to the respondent within 5 days with notice that the complaint conforms to the applicable rules.

(b) The respondent may, within 30 days of the Committee's notification, provide to the Committee any information relevant to a complaint filed with the Committee. The respondent may submit a written statement in response to the complaint. Such a statement shall be signed by the respondent. If the statement is prepared by counsel for the respondent, the respondent shall sign a representation that the respondent has reviewed the response and agrees with the factual assertions contained therein.

(c) The Committee staff may request information from the respondent or obtain additional information pertinent to the case from other sources prior to the establishment of an investigative subcommittee only when so directed by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(d) The respondent shall be notified in writing regarding the Committee's decision either to dismiss the complaint or to create an investigative subcommittee.

(e) The respondent shall be notified of the membership of the investigative subcommittee and shall have 10 days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and must be on the grounds that the subcommittee member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The subcommittee member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of any disqualification.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE-INITIATED INQUIRY

(a) Notwithstanding the absence of a filed complaint, the Committee may consider any

information in its possession indicating that a Member, officer, or employee may have committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, officer, or employee in the performance of the duties or the discharge of the responsibilities of such individual. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member may jointly gather additional information concerning such an alleged violation by a Member, officer, or employee unless and until an investigative subcommittee has been established.

(b) If the Committee votes to establish an investigative subcommittee, the Committee shall proceed in accordance with Rule 19.

(c) Any written request by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives that the Committee conduct an inquiry into such person's own conduct shall be considered in accordance with subsection (a) of this Rule.

(d) An inquiry shall not be undertaken regarding any alleged violation that occurred before the third previous Congress unless a majority of the Committee determines that the alleged violation is directly related to an alleged violation that occurred in a more recent Congress.

(e) An inquiry shall be undertaken by an investigative subcommittee with regard to any felony conviction of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives in a Federal, State, or local court who has been sentenced. Notwithstanding this provision, the Committee has the discretion to initiate an inquiry upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee at any time prior to conviction or sentencing.

RULE 19. INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE

(a) Upon the establishment of an investigative subcommittee, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall designate four members (with equal representation from the majority and minority parties) to serve as an investigative subcommittee to undertake an inquiry. Members of the Committee and Members of the House selected pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of Rule X of the House of Representatives are eligible for appointment to an investigative subcommittee, as determined by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. At the time of appointment, the Chair shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall designate one member of the subcommittee to serve as the ranking minority member of the investigative subcommittee. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as members of an investigative subcommittee, but may not serve as non-voting, ex-officio members.

(b) In an inquiry undertaken by an investigative subcommittee—

(1) All proceedings, including the taking of testimony, shall be conducted in executive session and all testimony taken by deposition or things produced pursuant to subpoena or otherwise shall be deemed to have been taken or produced in executive session.

(2) The Chair of the investigative subcommittee shall ask the respondent and all witnesses whether they intend to be represented by counsel. If so, the respondent or witnesses or their legal representatives shall provide written designation of counsel. A respondent or witness who is represented by counsel shall not be questioned in the absence of counsel unless an explicit waiver is obtained.

(3) The subcommittee shall provide the respondent an opportunity to present, orally or in writing, a statement, which must be

under oath or affirmation, regarding the allegations and any other relevant questions arising out of the inquiry.

(4) The staff may interview witnesses, examine documents and other evidence, and request that submitted statements be under oath or affirmation and that documents be certified as to their authenticity and accuracy.

(5) The subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary to the conduct of the inquiry. Unless the Committee otherwise provides, the subpoena power shall rest in the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee and a subpoena shall be issued upon the request of the investigative subcommittee.

(6) The subcommittee shall require that testimony be given under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chair or subcommittee member designated by the Chair to administer oaths.

(c) During the inquiry, the procedure respecting the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chair of the subcommittee or other presiding member at any investigative subcommittee proceeding shall rule upon any question of admissibility or pertinency of evidence, motion, procedure or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any rulings to the members present at that proceeding. A majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such appeal shall govern the question of admissibility, and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a person is determined by a majority vote to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(d) Upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the subcommittee members, and an affirmative vote of a majority of the full Committee, an investigative subcommittee may expand the scope of its investigation.

(e) Upon completion of the investigation, the staff shall draft for the investigative subcommittee a report that shall contain a comprehensive summary of the information received regarding the alleged violations.

(f) Upon completion of the inquiry, an investigative subcommittee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation if it determines that there is substantial reason to believe that a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives has occurred. If more than one violation is alleged, such Statement shall be divided into separate counts. Each count shall relate to a

separate violation, shall contain a plain and concise statement of the alleged facts of such violation, and shall include a reference to the provision of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation or other applicable standard of conduct governing the performance of duties or discharge of responsibilities alleged to have been violated. A copy of such Statement shall be transmitted to the respondent and the respondent's counsel.

(g) If the investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall transmit to the Committee a report containing a summary of the information received in the inquiry, its conclusions and reasons therefore, and any appropriate recommendation.

RULE 20. AMENDMENTS TO STATEMENTS OF ALLEGED VIOLATION

(a) An investigative subcommittee may, upon an affirmative vote of a majority of its members, amend its Statement of Alleged Violation anytime before the Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Committee; and

(b) If an investigative subcommittee amends its Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall be notified in writing and shall have 30 calendar days from the date of that notification to file an answer to the amended Statement of Alleged Violation.

RULE 21. COMMITTEE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

(a) Whenever an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation and transmits a report to that effect to the Committee, the Committee may by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members transmit such report to the House of Representatives;

(b) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation but recommends that no further action be taken, it shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation; and

(c) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent admits to the violations set forth in such Statement, the respondent waives the right to an adjudicatory hearing, and the respondent's waiver is approved by the Committee—

(1) the subcommittee shall prepare a report for transmittal to the Committee, a final draft of which shall be provided to the respondent not less than 15 calendar days before the subcommittee votes on whether to adopt the report;

(2) the respondent may submit views in writing regarding the final draft to the subcommittee within 7 calendar days of receipt of that draft;

(3) the subcommittee shall transmit a report to the Committee regarding the Statement of Alleged Violation together with any views submitted by the respondent pursuant to subparagraph (2), and the Committee shall make the report, together with the respondent's views, available to the public before the commencement of any sanction hearing; and

(4) the Committee shall by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members issue a report and transmit such report to the House of Representatives, together with the respondent's views previously submitted pursuant to subparagraph (2) and any additional views respondent may submit for attachment to the final report; and

(d) Members of the Committee shall have not less than 72 hours to review any report transmitted to the Committee by an investigative subcommittee before both the commencement of a sanction hearing and the Committee vote on whether to adopt the report.

RULE 22. RESPONDENT'S ANSWER

(a)(1) Within 30 days from the date of transmittal of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the respondent shall file with the investigative subcommittee an answer, in writing and under oath, signed by respondent and respondent's counsel. Failure to file an answer within the time prescribed shall be considered by the Committee as a denial of each count.

(2) The answer shall contain an admission to or denial of each count set forth in the Statement of Alleged Violation and may include negative, affirmative, or alternative defenses and any supporting evidence or other relevant information.

(b) The respondent may file a Motion for a Bill of Particulars within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation. If a Motion for a Bill of Particulars is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to such motion.

(c)(1) The respondent may file a Motion to Dismiss within 10 days of the date of transmittal of the Statement of Alleged Violation or, if a Motion for a Bill of Particulars has been filed, within 10 days of the date of the subcommittee's reply to the Motion for a Bill of Particulars. If a Motion to Dismiss is filed, the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 20 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss, unless the respondent previously filed a Motion for a Bill of Particulars, in which case the respondent shall not be required to file an answer until 10 days after the subcommittee has replied to the Motion to Dismiss. The investigative subcommittee shall rule upon any motion to dismiss filed during the period between the establishment of the subcommittee and the subcommittee's transmittal of a report or Statement of Alleged Violation to the Committee or to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member at the conclusion of an inquiry, and no appeal of the subcommittee's ruling shall lie to the Committee.

(2) A Motion to Dismiss may be made on the grounds that the Statement of Alleged Violation fails to state facts that constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or other applicable law, rule, regulation, or standard of conduct, or on the grounds that the Committee lacks jurisdiction to consider the allegations contained in the Statement.

(d) Any motion filed with the subcommittee pursuant to this rule shall be accompanied by a Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

(e)(1) The Chair of the investigative subcommittee, for good cause shown, may permit the respondent to file an answer or motion after the day prescribed above.

(2) If the ability of the respondent to present an adequate defense is not adversely affected and special circumstances so require, the Chair of the investigative subcommittee may direct the respondent to file an answer or motion prior to the day prescribed above.

(f) If the day on which any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading must be filed falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, such filing shall be made on the first business day thereafter.

(g) As soon as practicable after an answer has been filed or the time for such filing has expired, the Statement of Alleged Violation and any answer, motion, reply, or other pleading connected therewith shall be transmitted by the Chair of the investigative subcommittee to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE 23. ADJUDICATORY HEARINGS

(a) If a Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted to the Chair and Ranking Minor-

ity Member pursuant to Rule 22, and no waiver pursuant to Rule 26(b) has occurred, the Chair shall designate the members of the Committee who did not serve on the investigative subcommittee to serve on an adjudicatory subcommittee. The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the adjudicatory subcommittee unless they served on the investigative subcommittee. The respondent shall be notified of the designation of the adjudicatory subcommittee and shall have 10 days after such notice is transmitted to object to the participation of any subcommittee member. Such objection shall be in writing and shall be on the grounds that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of any disqualification.

(b) A majority of the adjudicatory subcommittee membership plus one must be present at all times for the conduct of any business pursuant to this rule.

(c) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall hold a hearing to determine whether any counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation have been proved by clear and convincing evidence and shall make findings of fact, except where such violations have been admitted by respondent.

(d) At an adjudicatory hearing, the subcommittee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other items as it deems necessary. Depositions, interrogatories, and sworn statements taken under any investigative subcommittee direction may be accepted into the hearing record.

(e) The procedures set forth in clause 2(g) and (k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to adjudicatory hearings. All such hearings shall be open to the public unless the adjudicatory subcommittee, pursuant to such clause, determines that the hearings or any part thereof should be closed.

(f)(1) The adjudicatory subcommittee shall, in writing, notify the respondent that the respondent and respondent's counsel have the right to inspect, review, copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, or other tangible objects that the adjudicatory subcommittee counsel intends to use as evidence against the respondent in an adjudicatory hearing. The respondent shall be given access to such evidence, and shall be provided the names of witnesses the subcommittee counsel intends to call, and a summary of their expected testimony, no less than 15 calendar days prior to any such hearing. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no evidence may be introduced or witness called in an adjudicatory hearing unless the respondent has been afforded a prior opportunity to review such evidence or has been provided the name of the witness.

(2) After a witness has testified on direct examination at an adjudicatory hearing, the Committee, at the request of the respondent, shall make available to the respondent any statement of the witness in the possession of the Committee which relates to the subject matter as to which the witness has testified.

(3) Any other testimony, statement, or documentary evidence in the possession of the Committee which is material to the respondent's defense shall, upon request, be made available to the respondent.

(g) No less than 5 days prior to the hearing, the respondent or counsel shall provide the adjudicatory subcommittee with the names of witnesses expected to be called, summaries of their expected testimony, and copies of any documents or other evidence proposed to be introduced.

(h) The respondent or counsel may apply to the subcommittee for the issuance of subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses or the production of evidence. The application shall be granted upon a showing by the respondent that the proposed testimony or evidence is relevant and not otherwise available to respondent. The application may be denied if not made at a reasonable time or if the testimony or evidence would be merely cumulative.

(i) During the hearing, the procedures regarding the admissibility of evidence and rulings shall be as follows:

(1) Any relevant evidence shall be admissible unless the evidence is privileged under the precedents of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Chair of the subcommittee or other presiding member at an adjudicatory subcommittee hearing shall rule upon any question of admissibility or pertinency of evidence, motion, procedure, or any other matter, and may direct any witness to answer any question under penalty of contempt. A witness, witness counsel, or a member of the subcommittee may appeal any ruling to the members present at that proceeding. A majority vote of the members present at such proceeding on such an appeal shall govern the question of admissibility and no appeal shall lie to the Committee.

(3) Whenever a witness is deemed by a Chair or other presiding member to be in contempt of the subcommittee, the matter may be referred to the Committee to determine whether to refer the matter to the House of Representatives for consideration.

(4) Committee counsel may, subject to subcommittee approval, enter into stipulations with the respondent and/or the respondent's counsel as to facts that are not in dispute.

(j) Unless otherwise provided, the order of an adjudicatory hearing shall be as follows:

(1) The Chair of the subcommittee shall open the hearing by stating the adjudicatory subcommittee's authority to conduct the hearing and the purpose of the hearing.

(2) The Chair shall then recognize Committee counsel and the respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving opening statements.

(3) Testimony from witnesses and other pertinent evidence shall be received in the following order whenever possible:

(i) witnesses (deposition transcripts and affidavits obtained during the inquiry may be used in lieu of live witnesses if the witness is unavailable) and other evidence offered by the Committee counsel,

(ii) witnesses and other evidence offered by the respondent,

(iii) rebuttal witnesses, as permitted by the Chair.

(4) Witnesses at a hearing shall be examined first by counsel calling such witness. The opposing counsel may then cross-examine the witness. Redirect examination and recross examination by counsel may be permitted at the Chair's discretion. Subcommittee members may then question witnesses. Unless otherwise directed by the Chair, questions by Subcommittee members shall be conducted under the five-minute rule.

(5) The Chair shall then recognize Committee counsel and respondent's counsel, in turn, for the purpose of giving closing arguments. Committee counsel may reserve time for rebuttal argument, as permitted by the Chair.

(k) A subpoena to a witness to appear at a hearing shall be served sufficiently in advance of that witness' scheduled appearance to allow the witness a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Chair of the adjudicatory subcommittee, to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel.

(1) Each witness appearing before the subcommittee shall be furnished a printed copy of the Committee rules, the pertinent provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses, and a copy of the Statement of Alleged Violation.

(m) Testimony of all witnesses shall be taken under oath or affirmation. The form of the oath or affirmation shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this subcommittee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so help you God)?" The oath or affirmation shall be administered by the Chair or Committee member designated by the Chair to administer oaths.

(n) At an adjudicatory hearing, the burden of proof rests on Committee counsel to establish the facts alleged in the Statement of Alleged Violation by clear and convincing evidence. However, Committee counsel need not present any evidence regarding any count that is admitted by the respondent or any fact stipulated.

(o) As soon as practicable after all testimony and evidence have been presented, the subcommittee shall consider each count contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation and shall determine by a majority vote of its members whether each count has been proved. If a majority of the subcommittee does not vote that a count has been proved, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted that the count was not proved. A count that is not proved shall be considered as dismissed by the subcommittee.

(p) The findings of the adjudicatory subcommittee shall be reported to the Committee.

RULE 24. SANCTION HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF SANCTIONS OR OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) If no count in a Statement of Alleged Violation is proved, the Committee shall prepare a report to the House of Representatives, based upon the report of the adjudicatory subcommittee.

(b) If an adjudicatory subcommittee completes an adjudicatory hearing pursuant to Rule 23 and reports that any count of the Statement of Alleged Violation has been proved, a hearing before the Committee shall be held to receive oral and/or written submissions by counsel for the Committee and counsel for the respondent as to the sanction the Committee should recommend to the House of Representatives with respect to such violations. Testimony by witnesses shall not be heard except by written request and vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) Upon completion of any proceeding held pursuant to clause (b), the Committee shall consider and vote on a motion to recommend to the House of Representatives that the House take disciplinary action. If a majority of the Committee does not vote in favor of the recommendation that the House of Representatives take action, a motion to reconsider that vote may be made only by a member who voted against the recommendation. The Committee may also, by majority vote, adopt a motion to issue a Letter of Reproval or take other appropriate Committee action.

(d) If the Committee determines a Letter of Reproval constitutes sufficient action, the Committee shall include any such letter as a part of its report to the House of Representatives.

(e) With respect to any proved counts against a Member of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Expulsion from the House of Representatives.

(2) Censure.

(3) Reprimand.

(4) Fine.

(5) Denial or limitation of any right, power, privilege, or immunity of the Member if under the Constitution the House of Representatives may impose such denial or limitation.

(6) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(f) With respect to any proved counts against an officer or employee of the House of Representatives, the Committee may recommend to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(1) Dismissal from employment.

(2) Reprimand.

(3) Fine.

(4) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(g) With respect to the sanctions that the Committee may recommend, reprimand is appropriate for serious violations, censure is appropriate for more serious violations, and expulsion of a Member or dismissal of an officer or employee is appropriate for the most serious violations. A recommendation of a fine is appropriate in a case in which it is likely that the violation was committed to secure a personal financial benefit; and a recommendation of a denial or limitation of a right, power, privilege, or immunity of a Member is appropriate when the violation bears upon the exercise or holding of such right, power, privilege, or immunity. This clause sets forth general guidelines and does not limit the authority of the Committee to recommend other sanctions.

(h) The Committee report shall contain an appropriate statement of the evidence supporting the Committee's findings and a statement of the Committee's reasons for the recommended sanction.

RULE 25. DISCLOSURE OF EXCULPATORY INFORMATION TO RESPONDENT

If the Committee, or any investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee at any time receives any exculpatory information respecting a Complaint or Statement of Alleged Violation concerning a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, it shall make such information known and available to the Member, officer, or employee as soon as practicable, but in no event later than the transmittal of evidence supporting a proposed Statement of Alleged Violation pursuant to Rule 26(c). If an investigative subcommittee does not adopt a Statement of Alleged Violation, it shall identify any exculpatory information in its possession at the conclusion of its inquiry and shall include such information, if any, in the subcommittee's final report to the Committee regarding its inquiry. For purposes of this rule, exculpatory evidence shall be any evidence or information that is substantially favorable to the respondent with respect to the allegations or charges before an investigative or adjudicatory subcommittee.

RULE 26. RIGHTS OF RESPONDENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) A respondent shall be informed of the right to be represented by counsel, to be provided at the respondent's own expense.

(b) A respondent may seek to waive any procedural rights or steps in the disciplinary process. A request for waiver must be in writing, signed by the respondent, and must detail what procedural steps the respondent seeks to waive. Any such request shall be subject to the acceptance of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) Not less than 10 calendar days before a scheduled vote by an investigative subcommittee on a Statement of Alleged Violation, the subcommittee shall provide the respondent with a copy of the Statement of Al-

leged Violation it intends to adopt together with all evidence it intends to use to prove those charges which it intends to adopt, including documentary evidence, witness testimony, memoranda of witness interviews, and physical evidence, unless the subcommittee by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members decides to withhold certain evidence in order to protect a witness, but if such evidence is withheld, the subcommittee shall inform the respondent that evidence is being withheld and of the count to which such evidence relates.

(d) Neither the respondent nor respondent's counsel shall, directly or indirectly, contact the subcommittee or any member thereof during the period of time set forth in paragraph (c) except for the sole purpose of settlement discussions where counsels for the respondent and the subcommittee are present.

(e) If, at any time after the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee or any subcommittee thereof determines that it intends to use evidence not provided to a respondent under paragraph (c) to prove the charges contained in the Statement of Alleged Violation (or any amendment thereof), such evidence shall be made immediately available to the respondent, and it may be used in any further proceeding under the Committee's rules.

(f) Evidence provided pursuant to paragraph (c) or (e) shall be made available to the respondent and respondent's counsel only after each agrees, in writing, that no document, information, or other materials obtained pursuant to that paragraph shall be made public until—

(1) such time as a Statement of Alleged Violation is made public by the Committee if the respondent has waived the adjudicatory hearing; or

(2) the commencement of an adjudicatory hearing if the respondent has not waived an adjudicatory hearing; but the failure of respondent and respondent's counsel to so agree in writing, and therefore not receive the evidence, shall not preclude the issuance of a Statement of Alleged Violation at the end of the period referenced to in (c).

(g) A respondent shall receive written notice whenever—

(1) the Chair and Ranking Minority Member determine that information the Committee has received constitutes a complaint;

(2) a complaint or allegation is transmitted to an investigative subcommittee;

(3) that subcommittee votes to authorize its first subpoena or to take testimony under oath, whichever occurs first; and

(4) the Committee votes to expand the scope of the inquiry of an investigative subcommittee.

(h) Whenever an investigative subcommittee adopts a Statement of Alleged Violation and a respondent enters into an agreement with that subcommittee to settle a complaint on which the Statement is based, that agreement, unless the respondent requests otherwise, shall be in writing and signed by the respondent and the respondent's counsel, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, and outside counsel, if any.

(i) Statements or information derived solely from a respondent or respondent's counsel during any settlement discussions between the Committee or a subcommittee thereof and the respondent shall not be included in any report of the subcommittee or the Committee or otherwise publicly disclosed without the consent of the respondent.

(j) Whenever a motion to establish an investigative subcommittee does not prevail, the Committee shall promptly send a letter to the respondent informing the respondent of such vote.

(k) Witnesses shall be afforded a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Committee or subcommittee, to prepare for an appearance before an investigative subcommittee or for an adjudicatory hearing and to obtain counsel.

(l) Prior to their testimony, witnesses shall be furnished a printed copy of the Committee's Rules of Procedure and the provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses.

(m) Witnesses may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chair may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional responsibility on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House of Representatives for contempt.

(n) Each witness subpoenaed to provide testimony or other evidence shall be provided the same per diem rate as established, authorized, and regulated by the Committee on House Administration for Members, officers and employees of the House, and, as the Chair considers appropriate, actual expenses of travel to or from the place of examination. No compensation shall be authorized for attorney's fees or for a witness' lost earnings. Such per diem may not be paid if a witness had been summoned at the place of examination.

(o) With the approval of the Committee, a witness, upon request, may be provided with a transcript of the witness' own deposition or other testimony taken in executive session, or, with the approval of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member, may be permitted to examine such transcript in the office of the Committee. Any such request shall be in writing and shall include a statement that the witness, and counsel, agree to maintain the confidentiality of all executive session proceedings covered by such transcript.

RULE 27. FRIVOLOUS FILINGS

If a complaint or information offered as a complaint is deemed frivolous by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, the Committee may take such action as it, by an affirmative vote of a majority deems appropriate in the circumstances.

RULE 28. REFERRALS TO FEDERAL OR STATE AUTHORITIES

Referrals made under clause 3(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives may be made by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BERKLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

50,000 RESIDUAL TROOPS IS UNACCEPTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, last Friday President Obama declared that he has "begun the work of ending" our Nation's occupation of Iraq. The American people have waited a long, long time to hear those words. I welcome the President's announcement that he

will keep his promise to bring our troops home. The President also pledged to pursue sustained diplomacy with all nations of the Middle East, including Iran and Syria, and he promised to help resettle the millions of Iraqis who have been displaced by the conflict. I welcome these important steps as well.

But I am deeply troubled by other parts of the administration's withdrawal plan. It calls for an end to our combat mission in 19 months, but up to 50,000 troops will remain in Iraq after that time until the end of 2011, 3 more years from now, in fact. The administration is calling these troops a "transitional force." Well, you can call it what you want, but such a large number of troops can only be viewed by the Iraqi people as an enduring occupation force.

Madam Speaker, leaving 50,000 residual troops is simply unacceptable. So long as the United States is viewed as an occupier, the Iraqi people will not be able to reclaim their full sovereignty and they will not be able to achieve the reconciliation and unification necessary for long-term stability and for democracy in their country.

That's why I believe the best approach is to bring all troops out of Iraq by 2010 and coordinate the removal with investments in reconciliation and reconstruction efforts. The faster we promote unification of the Iraqi people and help them to rebuild their country, the sooner we will be able to bring all of our troops home.

I'm also troubled with the administration's plan for several other reasons. First, although the residual force of 50,000 troops may not have a combat mission, they will still be in harm's way. Over 35,000 American troops, Madam Speaker, have already been killed or wounded in Iraq. We do not need to add to the casualty list.

Second, the President said that there will surely be difficult periods and tactical adjustments during the withdrawal of combat troops. I worry that this means the withdrawal could be delayed. It might even mean that the administration might ultimately seek to renegotiate the Status of Forces Agreement and keep troops in Iraq beyond 2011. That would lead to the worst possible result, an endless occupation of Iraq.

Third, the administration has abandoned its plan to withdraw a brigade a month, with only 10,000 troops withdrawn this year. The great majority of the troops will be withdrawn toward the end of the 19-month period. This means that the troop level will remain essentially the same for well over a year.

Fourth, the administration has not called for the withdrawal of American military contractors in Iraq. They must be withdrawn as well because the Iraqi people see them as part of the occupying force.

And, fifth, keeping a large force in Iraq will continue to drain our Treas-

ury. We cannot continue to pour unnecessary billions of dollars into the occupation of Iraq when we need the money here at home to fight our recession.

Madam Speaker, the President has taken an important step toward developing a plan to leave Iraq, but the American people have waited long enough for our troops and military contractors to come home to their families. I urge the administration to produce a new plan, a plan that will end the occupation once and for all. That means withdrawing our troops and military contractors in 19 months, or even sooner if that could happen, without residual forces and without private contractors left behind.

BORDER WAR WITH DRUG CARTELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I bring you news from the second front. As reported by Sara Carter, the enemy has more than 100,000 foot soldiers. And I'm not talking about al Qaeda and I'm not talking about the Taliban in Iraq or Afghanistan. I'm talking about the drug cartels south of the border in Mexico.

The Mexican army isn't much larger than 100,000; so the drug cartels have almost as many foot soldiers as the Mexican military. And the Mexican military, we understand, has been infiltrated by the drug cartels. And these drug cartels are violent.

There are two major ones. The Sinaloa cartel, also known as the Federation, and the Zetas cartel, which is known in America as the Gulf cartel. And they both operate down Mexico way.

There are four commodities that are being sold and traded across the U.S./Mexico border. Two commodities go north and two of them go south. Going north, operated by the drug cartels, of course, are drugs. Also, the drug cartels working with the coyotes are bringing people into the United States, both illegally done.

Going south are guns that the drug cartels end up using and, of course, that money, that filthy lucre that funds all of this process.

Right here, Madam Speaker, I have a photograph that was taken this past weekend in Juarez, Mexico, right across the border from El Paso, Texas. It's a population of about four times the size of El Paso. And the Mexican government has tried to do something about it. You see here federal police officers, a convoy, that goes for a mile, going into Juarez to try to control the drug cartels. Here you have peace officers or federal peace officers or military with M-16 rifles.

Madam Speaker, it's a war zone. It's a border war. And I commend the President of the Mexico for trying to

stop the violence on his side of the border. But we are naive to think it's not going to come to the United States because eventually it will. It is a national security issue, Madam Speaker.

Some say that Mexico will be a failed state because of the drug cartels' influence, and it's certainly a tough situation for Mexican nationals that live along the border. I've been on both sides of the border, and I've seen it's a tough situation for people who live there because they live in fear because the drug cartels are fearless and they would do anything to bring those drugs into the United States.

Our own State Department has issued a spring break advisory: Don't go to Mexico. It's not safe to go down there. There are beheadings of local and law enforcement officers. There are kidnappings of not only Mexican nationals but Americans that are being kidnapped now on our side of the border. It's a violent place, Madam Speaker. The United States now says that only Pakistan and Iran are more of a national security concern than Mexico. That's serious, and we should be concerned about it.

We now understand, of course, about the corruption in the Mexican Government. Even though President Calderon is trying to do what he can, you see, those drug cartels pay their criminals a whole lot more money than these federal peace officers get paid, and they switch sides and some of them even work for the federal government in Mexico. So he's put troops on the border. I'm talking about the President of the Mexico. He's put several thousands of troops on the border. Several thousand went into Juarez to try to stop the drug cartels from operating there.

More importantly, Madam Speaker, this is a national security issue for the United States. Both sides of the border are violent, and we need to do everything we can to deal with this problem.

The first thing we need to do is realize it's going on. In last year's election, neither person running for President ever mentioned the border problem. They didn't want to talk about that. It wasn't politically correct.

We have to deal with this issue. We have to help the Border Patrol. We need to change the rules of engagement. The Border Patrol, right now they can't shoot anybody unless they're shot at. They have got to take the first bullet; so they back off.

We need to help the sheriffs. One of the sheriffs down in Texas told me that the drug cartels outgun them, out-finance them and out-man them. They've got better equipment, more money, and more people. A deputy sheriff in South Texas makes about \$12,000 a year. A guy running drugs or guns across the border will make that much in 2 weeks. It's important that we help them.

And, of course, I think that we ought to put our troops on the border. If we put our troops, the National Guard, on the border, people will quit crossing.

Mexico is doing what it can with its military, but we won't do that because we might offend somebody.

Down the road the United States has to deal with the real problem, and that's the tremendous addiction Americans have for illicit drugs. We have to deal with that or this is all going to continue. But until we fix that problem, we need to stop the crime from coming into the United States.

It is time, Madam Speaker, that we realize the truth because the first duty of government is not building roads and bridges and sending money to museums and foreign aid. The first duty of government is to protect the people. That's the people of the United States. And our government needs to get with the program and send the National Guard to the border.

And that's just the way it is.

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE SUPPORT FOR REDESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, the Navy and Marine Corps have operated as one entity for more than two centuries, and H.R. 24 would enable the name of their department to illustrate this fact.

For the past 7 years, the full House of Representatives has supported this change as part of the National Defense Authorization Act. This year I'm grateful to have the support of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former Marine who recently introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 504. I hope that the Senate will support the House position and join in bringing proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and Marine Corps. The Marines who are fighting today in Afghanistan and Iraq deserve this recognition.

Madam Speaker, last month I had the privilege of addressing more than 200 Marine Corps veterans and retirees at the Marine Corps League's mid-winter conference. The Marine Corps League has nearly 70,000 members nationwide, and their shared mission is preserving the traditions and promoting the interests of the United States Marine Corps.

As in years past, I spoke to their mid-winter conference about legislation introduced like H.R. 24 to designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. The Marine Corps League has proudly endorsed this legislation and has pledged to work with my office to secure its passage by the House and Senate. Over the years I have been encouraged by the overwhelming support I have received for this change from so many members and veterans of the United States Armed Forces.

I am honored to have the support of Michael Blum, the national executive

director of the Marine Corps League. He's a highly decorated combat marine, who served honorably off the coast of Cuba during the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. He also served his country in the Philippines, Korea, and Vietnam. It is because of great marines like Michael Blum that I continue to champion this cause for the United States Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, I want to also thank Senator PAT ROBERTS for joining me on the Senate side in this effort to rename the Department of Navy to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

And before I close, I would like to point out the importance of this. There are many important reasons why this should take place. The history of both the Navy and Marine Corps, the fact that they are one fighting team. But, Madam Speaker, with our Marines and Army and other personnel dying in Afghanistan and Iraq, I want to show you exactly why and how this would be important to a Marine family who lost a loved one fighting for this great Nation.

I have a poster that is actually a letter from the current Secretary of the Navy. It's a condolence letter. Certainly I took the family's name out and the deceased's name. And I will read just one sentence, Madam Speaker: From the Secretary of the Navy, November 18, 2008: "On behalf of the Department of the Navy, please accept my very sincere condolences on the loss of your son Captain Joseph A. Marine." Obviously we substituted that last name out of respect.

□ 1645

Madam Speaker, if this should become the law of the land, and it is so, so justified that we would have the Department of Navy and Marine Corps as one, one fighting team, this is what the condolence letter would say, Madam Speaker. It would say the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, Washington D.C., November 18 of 2008, and it would say, "Dear Marine Corps Family: On behalf of the Department of Navy and Marine Corps, please accept my very sincere condolences."

Madam Speaker, this is only right. I want to thank the House of Representatives, Congressman and former Chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, DUNCAN HUNTER, and present Chairman IKE SKELTON for always supporting this legislation, and my many colleagues who have done so. This year, with the help of Senator PAT ROBERTS, I think this can become a reality.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask God to continue to bless our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq, to bless their families, to bless the families who have given a loved one dying for freedom. And I ask God three times, please, God; please, God; please God, continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WE HAVE SEVERE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, we have got severe economic problems. People are losing their homes. People who are staying in their homes are having a very difficult time making their payments, and we really need to do everything we can to help them.

Now, the Obama administration has a budget that they proposed, and I wish everybody in America was paying attention. I can't talk to them directly, but if they were paying attention, I would like to tell them that President Obama's budget cuts their mortgage interest deduction. It reduces their mortgage interest deduction.

So if you have a house, Madam Speaker, and you are paying your mortgage, the interest on that mortgage is tax deductible, and he is going to reduce, get this, he is going to reduce the tax deductibility of part of your mortgage interest.

I am sure that's going to really stimulate the purchase of homes and help the economy. This is not what he promised. It's going to be, in effect, a tax increase. And we have got charitable institutions around this country, churches, the Salvation Army, all kinds of charitable institutions that do so much good for this country. And we really, we really admire them for that, and we give money to them, and we deduct that money from our taxes because it's a charitable contribution.

And, you know, President Obama's budget is going to reduce the amount that you can deduct from your taxes for charitable contributions. Now, I don't know, I don't know what the purpose of that is. I guess he is trying to raise more money in taxes.

But the fact of the matter is those charitable institutions are going to get less money because you can't deduct all of that money from your taxes, as you have in the past. They are reducing it dramatically.

And so where are the people going to go who depend on those charitable institutions if they don't have the money to help them? Well, you guessed it, the government. We will just raise your taxes and spend more money on bailouts and everything else to help those who are in need.

But right now, if a charity wants to help somebody, we can give them money and we could deduct it from our taxes. I wish everybody in America realized this. We were promised so much, we were promised everything was going to be better, that taxes were going to be lowered, that everybody is going to be living better, and everything has been going south.

We are spending money like it's going out of style, trillions and trillions of dollars, so much money that people can't even comprehend it and our kids and our grandkids are going to be paying for it with higher taxes and very high inflation. And, folks, let me just tell you, my colleagues, that inflation ain't too far off, because as fast as they are printing money, it's going to happen pretty fast.

So let me just say to my colleagues and everybody, we really need to take a hard look at that budget, and we should not allow charitable deductions and the taxes on it to be reduced, the tax deductibility reduced. And mortgage interest, we should not allow there to be a reduction in the tax deductibility of mortgage interest. It will hurt the economy.

I hope President Obama is listening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REVENUE NEUTRAL CARBON TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, the last couple of weeks I have been discussing opportunity and the danger that we confront with our energy insecurity. There is this enormous danger that was talked about over the last couple of weeks. There is also this incredible opportunity to create new jobs.

And to give you an idea of what that means in a district, the Fourth District of South Carolina, one of the six in South Carolina, has the wonderful fortune of having General Electric make gas turbines and wind turbines there. They have somewhere around 1,500 engineers and somewhere around 1,500 production employees, and at that facility they make wind turbines. They tell me that 1 percent of the world's electricity right now is made by the wind.

If it goes to 2 percent, it's \$100 billion in sales. I am pretty excited about that because, presumably, a lot of that money would be attributed to the Greenville facility and jobs would be created there.

So the question is how do you get from here to there? By the way, Madam Speaker, the Department of Energy says that we can, in the United States, get to 20 percent of our electricity being made by the wind, and we consume 25 percent of the world's electricity. So it's a tremendous business opportunity.

So how do we get from here, the intention of having fuels of the future, to the reality of fuels of the future? Well, I think it's all about economics. It's all about whether there is a price signal and an internalizing of the externals associated with fossil fuels—and that's what I talked about last week here on the floor—is the need to internalize externals associated with some of our fossil fuels, especially coal in the case electricity; and in the case of the national security risk we are running with petroleum, the externalities associated with what comes out of our tail pipes and the national security risk associated with what we put in the gas tank.

So if you start attaching those externals to the price of the product, then some good things start happening and we start moving toward this incredible opportunity. So the opportunity at hand for us in a place like Greenville, South Carolina, is to create jobs by having a price signal sent through the marketplace that coal, for example, is no longer going to get the freebie that it has gotten. Right now, it's free good in the air. You can belch and burn all you want without any accountability for what's going up there.

That's a pretty good deal if you are the one belching and burning. But if you are the guy across the street who has got a better technology, a cleaner technology, a technology of the future, rather than of the past, then you are not going to take out that incumbent technology until a price signal is sent that could be sent by attaching the externals associated with the production of electricity by something like coal.

So what I am here to suggest, Madam Speaker, is that what we should be looking at is a revenue neutral carbon tax, revenue neutral in that you start with a tax reduction, reduce payroll taxes. In fact, I would like to eliminate them, but reducing payroll taxes is a first step.

Second step, apply a transparent tax to carbon. The result would be that no additional taxation would be coming to the U.S. government. The burden would not be greater on the American citizen, but we would send a price signal that would cause companies like General Electric to be able to see their way clear to make those wind turbines and electricity generators to buy those gas turbines because the freebie, the

free good in the air, would no longer be going to the coal-fired plants.

So it's an incredible opportunity for us, Madam Speaker, that we begin this move towards fuels of the future. It starts with sound economics, conservative principles of accountability and of attaching externals to internalize the externals associated with some fossil fuels.

If we do that, Madam Speaker, the future is very bright in creating jobs in America. I am very excited about that and look forward to talking about it more with my colleagues as we go forward to figure out a way we can break this addiction to foreign oil and to power our lives in cleaner and job-producing ways.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INVESTIGATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EARMARK AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, last week I offered a privileged resolution which would have required the House Ethics Committee to investigate the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions.

This resolution was prompted by the revelation that the Department of Justice is investigating a powerhouse lobbying firm, the PMA Group, for irregularities, including apparent strawman contributions to Members of Congress. Many Members of Congress receiving PMA contributions have gone on to secure earmarks for the firm's clients.

This is no small matter. The PMA Group had revenues of 18 million last year alone, made contributions to more than 100 Members of this body and secured some 300 million in earmarks for its clients in one bill alone, the 2008 Defense Appropriations bill. My resolution last week was tabled with a vote of 226-182 with 12 Members voting present.

Now during the course of last week I had numerous discussions with Members of this body who felt that the "resolved" clauses in the resolution were too broad, that the Ethics Committee did not have the time or resources to undertake such a task. Now, for the record, I disagree. I feel that with such a cloud as this over this House, we have an obligation to do whatever it takes to ensure that the dignity and the decorum of the House are maintained.

But with the failure of last week's privileged resolution, the cloud over

the House remains, a cloud that will stay as long as we fail to take action. I have therefore narrowed the resolution.

I offered last week to address only the PMA Group. The new privileged resolution simply states that the House Ethics Committee will investigate the earmark company made on behalf of clients of the PMA Group. There are some who may believe that the announcement by the PMA Group that it will dissolve at the end of the month absolves us of our responsibility to take action. I would remind them that the omnibus spending bill that will likely go to the President later this week contains more than a dozen earmarks for clients of the PMA Group.

Let me put it in plain language. The legislation we will send to the President later this week contains no-bid contracts for clients of the PMA Group, an organization that is currently under investigation by the Department of Justice.

Further, there are Members of Congress who secured these no-bid contracts and received campaign contributions from the PMA Group, an organization that is currently under investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice. If this doesn't warrant an investigation by the House Ethics Committee, Madam Speaker, what does?

Again, Madam Speaker, let's be clear. This is not a partisan resolution. No Member of this body is referenced in the resolution, nor is there reference to a political party. The cloud that hangs over this institution rains on Republicans and Democrats alike. It is our responsibility, all of us, to let the sun shine on this institution once more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING ARMY FIRST LIEUTENANT NICOLAS ESLINGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce my colleagues and the Nation to a constituent of the 22nd District and a true American hero.

His name is Army First Lieutenant Nicholas Eslinger, "Nick," from the great town of Missouri City, Texas, and his actions on the battlefield of Iraq are nothing short of extraordinary. While serving as a platoon leader during Operation Iraqi Freedom in Samarra during a dismounted patrol, First Lieutenant Eslinger and his men were attacked. When the enemy threw

a grenade at his men, Lieutenant Eslinger didn't dive for cover, he dove at the grenade, picked it up, and, like a Nolan Ryan fastball, threw it back at the enemy.

While his quick reaction saved the lives of his men, Lieutenant Eslinger wasn't finished. Like a true Texan, he took off after the enemy combatant, eventually leading to the enemy combatant's arrest and detention. For his quick thinking and courageous action, Lieutenant Eslinger was awarded our country's second highest combat award, the Silver Star.

This past Saturday I had the privilege and the opportunity to visit Nick, along with his mother Donna, his father Bruce, his brother Danny, and many neighbors and friends at their home in Missouri City. Before leaving, Lieutenant Eslinger gave me a unit medallion of the Charlie Company, 2nd Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne, commonly referred to as "No Slack." It is something I am honored to have received and something I will carry with me with pride for the rest of my life.

Yesterday my State celebrated the 173rd anniversary of the Texas Declaration of Independence. Early in our fight for independence, at the Battle of Gonzalez, the Mexican army tried to seize the town's only cannon. The volunteers of Gonzalez, facing a much larger professional military force, might have been smart to hand over that cannon. Instead, they raised a flag that said "Come and Take It." In Lieutenant Eslinger's brave actions, I see the same spirit of defiance in the face of violence and the refusal to be intimidated that helped my State to achieve its independence.

Among thousands of other men and women who make sacrifices and perform courageous deeds for their country, perhaps some at this very moment, Lieutenant Eslinger's actions are worthy of special recognition, and I am proud to do so today.

Nick, thank you for the coin. Thank you for your service. God bless you and your family.

□ 1700

BENEFITS OF THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the Speaker for her leadership and the opportunity to address my colleagues on what I think is a very important topic.

Of course, first I wish to wish my great State of Texas happy independence day, March 2, 2009, which was yesterday, and celebrate the courage of those fighters who declared their independence from Mexico. Texans are an independent bunch, but we are a patriotic bunch and we love this country,

and I believe it is important to address the leadership that sits just a few blocks away that is attempting to take this Nation to another level of economic empowerment and change.

It is important, Madam Speaker, to articulate more clearly the purposes of the economic stimulus package and the bankruptcy bill that will come to this floor in just a couple of days. Both of those bills respond to the needs of the average working American. It is important to note that the economic stimulus package has no earmarks and it is to generate jobs and those jobs are to be in the private sector.

Over the last 2 weeks, Madam Speaker, I have sat down in my school districts speaking to each superintendent asking them to establish an economic stimulus task force that would ensure that the dollars that would come through this stimulus package would be, first of all, used to educate our children; would be limited in its use for administrative costs; would be focusing on saving teachers' jobs or creating teachers' jobs; would focus on Title I; and would help modernize schools and hire contractors who would then hire people who are out of work in the private sector. School districts typically don't build or modernize their schools. Those are jobs, \$10 billion in the stimulus package.

Recently I have walked through unemployment offices to focus on getting job training dollars so that people could alter their careers and be able to be prepared for the 21st century workplace, such as being prepared for the green jobs that are also part of the economic stimulus package. Weatherization, \$5 billion for weatherization of our buildings and homes both in the cold weather and the hot weather. Those are jobs, Madam Speaker, that have not been created before. They are not jobs in the government. They are jobs in the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I went on to meet with the Texas Department of Transportation to ensure that contracts are shovel-ready; that new small businesses and minority businesses and women-owned businesses are being hired, that they are able to be proud of what they put on the Web site and that they actually do create jobs.

Just yesterday, I met with the mayor of Houston, the fourth largest city in the Nation, and the department heads, seeking creatively how we can enhance and beautify distressed areas, depressed areas, both in rural and urban areas, which was the purpose of the President's desire.

By the way, Madam Speaker, I can tell you that earmarks should not be labeled as being fraudulent. They should be transparent. They are not an added expenditure of dollars. They are simply allowing the people of the district, the State of Texas, the State of New York or Mississippi or Georgia or California to be able to assess where those moneys can be used more effectively. But we don't have any earmarks in the stimulus package.

The bankruptcy bill, which has been much maligned in certain areas, and I am very glad we are coming together to think together, is really a bill that responds to the little person, the person who was responsible, the person who really feels that bankruptcy may in fact be a shameful thing to do, but are working every day trying to make ends meet. They are making their payments, but they are falling behind as they try to make those payments.

What it does is it allows a judge to assess whether that person is able to more effectively keep their house if they are able to cram down the amount of the mortgage. But what happens, Madam Speaker, is that if that house is ultimately sold, any profit goes back to the lender. Where is the help for the little guy? Where is the help for the struggling homeowner and American who works every day? It is the bankruptcy court. That will not be a free ride.

In addition, I hope to offer legislation that indicates that if a buyer was manipulated with an adjustable rate or predatory lending, that their missteps in their mortgage, that their faltering, does not impact their credit score, which then ends their ability to be part of the economic resurgence that will come about over the next couple of months and years as we begin to see the economic stimulus package work.

This is not a tough task. I voted against the TARP originally. Money is being given to big banks. But what I believe is we have got to recapitalize our markets and restore our housing market.

Madam Speaker, we are on the right path. Let's do it in unity. Let's not forget the hard-working Americans who now need to have their day by passing the bankruptcy bill and making sure the stimulus package works.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LIFE ON THE DOWNSIDE OF THE LAFFER CURVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, the Laffer Curve is a simple but eloquent method of demonstrating how increasing taxes reduces economic productivity until a point of equilibrium is reached when further tax hikes actually reduce revenue. If the tax rate is zero, tax revenues are zero. But if the tax rate is 100 percent, tax revenues also reach zero, because there is no point in working. Thus, every increase in a tax rate produces a progressively

smaller return of tax revenues as people adjust their behavior to reflect the reduced value of their work. When taxes exceed an economic tipping point, revenues begin to fall.

California vividly demonstrated this effect in 1991 when Governor Pete Wilson imposed the biggest State tax increase in American history. That \$7 billion tax hike, a staggering combination of increases in sales and income and car taxes, broke the back of California's economy. While the rest of the Nation's economy expanded, the tax hike put California into a nosedive, including the biggest plunge in retail sales in 30 years. Those taxes brought in barely half of the new revenue that had been predicted and then produced two consecutive years of billion dollar a year declines in State revenues.

Well, Madam Speaker, California is about to get another very expensive lesson in the Laffer Curve, courtesy of a \$13 billion tax increase just approved by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. That hike will sock an average family with more than \$1,200 of new taxes.

We should watch California's experience very carefully in the days ahead, because it is going to be a harbinger of the impact that we can expect under President Obama's proposed tax increases. Although California already has the highest sales tax in the Nation, it is about to go up by 13 percent, or a penny on the dollar. Although California has the highest income tax in the Nation, it is about to go up another quarter percent. Although California's sales tax is the second biggest generator of revenue for the State and automobile sales comprise a fifth of all sales taxes, the State has also doubled the car tax and is lobbying for new regulations which will increase the price of a new car by as much as \$5,000.

Benjamin Franklin said that "experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other." Appropriately, the California tax increases will take effect on April Fool's Day, illustrating that some people don't even learn from experience.

But perhaps some good will come of it for the Nation. If California's experience with the Wilson tax increases is any indication, the impact of the Schwarzenegger tax hike is likely to be immediate and devastating. I believe it could serve as an invaluable lesson for the Obama administration, which last week announced a whopping tax increase of \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years, averaging about \$1,800 per family per year.

Now, I know, the President promises these taxes will only fall on the "very wealthy," those folks who earn \$125,000 as individuals or \$250,000 as couples. But the fact is that 65 percent of those folks aren't really folks at all. They are small businesses that are the very foundation of our economy, many of which are barely holding on as it is. The other tax will directly hammer families with higher energy and consumer prices through a \$656 billion carbon tax.

Now, it is not that another example should be necessary. Herbert Hoover's response to the recession of 1929 was to increase the marginal tax rate from 25 percent to 65 percent and to burden international trade with steep tariffs.

The Obama taxes have yet to be enacted, and if passed this year they won't take effect until 2010. By then, California will have become a poster child for "governments gone wild," a vivid warning of life on the downside of the Laffer Curve, and a lesson that the rest of the Nation should pay rapt attention to as we consider the impact of the administration's proposal for higher taxes nationally.

LOOKING FOR SOLUTIONS TO THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS FACING AMERICA TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have talked a lot these past few weeks about the state of the economy and the challenges that Americans are facing. Certainly they are remarkable challenges that we face all across this Nation. The stock market was again down today.

So we look for solutions. The American people are demanding solutions on behalf of those folks that they sent to Washington, and rightly so. The "solution" I guess one could call it of the Obama administration is the budget that he proposed last week, and I would like to point out a few items on that budget.

The deficits from that budget will be \$1.75 trillion in this year, 12.3 percent of our gross domestic product, more than triple the previous year. A solution? I don't think so.

How about national debt. This budget that the President proposed doubles the national debt in just 8 years. Do the American people think that is a solution? I don't think so.

Interest. Beginning in 2012, the interest that we pay on the debt will be \$1 billion a day, Madam Speaker. \$1 billion a day. That is not a solution.

Taxes. You have heard my colleagues discuss, Madam Speaker, that this budget raises taxes by \$1.4 trillion, and it is on everybody, not just those that the President says can easily afford it.

And how about spending? Well, \$3.9 trillion in 2009, 27 percent of our gross domestic product, a record level, the highest level since World War II. Solutions? I don't think so.

But, Madam Speaker, the good news is that there are solutions out there. They are wonderful solutions. Those of us who are members of the Republican Study Committee put on the table H.R. 476, the Economic Recovery Act, something that we believe would be a powerful solution that would allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money, decrease some of the incredible roadblocks in the face of businesses so

that they can create jobs, and finally begin to decrease the amount of spending at the Federal level.

Other big thinkers across this Nation are providing solutions as well. One of them is the group American Solutions headed by former Speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich.

They recently came out with a proposal "12 American Solutions for Jobs and Prosperity," talking about the Washington solutions currently being produced by this administration being more money for more government, more power for more politicians, more debt and more bureaucrats. That is not what will lead to real job growth and prosperity. Instead, there are 12 specific solutions that I would like to share with the House of Representatives.

First, payroll tax stimulus. A new tax credit to offset 50 percent of the payroll tax would immediately inject money into small businesses and allow for job creation.

Second, real middle income tax relief, proposing to decrease the marginal rate of 25 percent to 15 percent so that 9 out of 10 American workers have a flat tax of 15 percent. Real money in the pockets of real Americans. Real solutions.

□ 1715

Third, reduce the business tax rate.

Did you know, Madam Speaker, that Mexico and Sweden and Poland and Ireland and Hungary all have lower business taxes than the United States? If you're a business trying to decide where to put your company, you'd go somewhere else other than the United States if you were taking into account business tax rates.

The proposal is to decrease our business tax rate to 12.5 percent; equal Ireland's, instead of the current 35 percent that we have.

Fourth, homeowners assistance. Provide tax credit incentives for responsible home buyers so they can stay in their homes.

Fifth, control spending so we can move to a balanced budget.

Madam Speaker, did you know that the budget that the President put on the table last week never gets to a balanced budget? Never, never. Red numbers as far as the eye can see. We must have a balanced budget.

Sixth, no State aid without protection from fraud; making certain that the State governments ensure that there's no fraud and no theft of the hard-earned taxpayer money that they receive from the Federal Government.

Seventh, more American energy now. We absolutely must utilize American resources while we're conserving and while we're finding that new technology that will carry us through this century.

Eighth, abolish taxes on capital gain. We ought to match China and Singapore, yes, Madam Speaker, China and Singapore and lower the taxes, abolish the taxes on capital gains. You talk

about a job creation. My goodness gracious.

Ninth, protect our right to vote in the workplace. This majority is going to steal that right away with the secret ballot destruction act that they are proposing to put on the floor. We believe that it's imperative that workers have the right to a secret ballot when talking about forming a union.

Tenth, replace Sarbanes-Oxley.

Eleventh, abolish the death tax once and for all.

And, twelfth, invest in energy and transportation infrastructure. Real solutions for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at those kinds of solutions that will actually get the economy rolling and create jobs.

12 AMERICAN SOLUTIONS FOR JOBS & PROSPERITY

Washington solutions of more money for more government, more power for politicians, more debt, and more bureaucrats will not lead to real growth in jobs and prosperity. We need a clear and decisive alternative that creates jobs and rewards work, saving, and investment.

1. Payroll Tax Stimulus. With a temporary new tax credit to offset 50% of the payroll tax, every small business would have more money, and all Americans would take home more of what they earn.

2. Real Middle-Income Tax Relief. Reduce the marginal tax rate of 25% down to 15%, in effect establishing a flat-rate tax of 15% for close to 9 out of 10 American workers.

3. Reduce the Business Tax Rate. Match Ireland's rate of 12.5% to keep more jobs in America.

4. Homeowner's Assistance. Provide tax credit incentives to responsible home buyers so they can keep their homes.

5. Control Spending So We Can Move to a Balanced Budget. This begins with eliminating Congressional earmarks and wasteful pork-barrel spending.

6. No State Aid Without Protection From Fraud. Require state governments to adopt anti-fraud and anti-theft policies before giving them more money.

7. More American Energy Now. Explore for more American oil and gas and invest in affordable energy for the future, including clean coal, ethanol, nuclear power and renewable fuels.

8. Abolish Taxes on Capital Gains. Match China, Singapore and many other competitors. More investment in America means more jobs in America.

9. Protect Our Right to Vote in the Workplace. We must protect a worker's right to decide by secret ballot whether to join a union. Forced unionism will kill jobs at a time when we can't afford to lose them.

10. Replace Sarbanes-Oxley. This failed law is crippling entrepreneurial startups. Replace it with affordable rules that help create jobs, not destroy them.

11. Abolish the Death Tax. Americans should work for their families, not for Washington.

12. Invest in Energy and Transportation Infrastructure. This includes a new, expanded electric power grid and a 21st century air traffic control system that will reduce delays in air travel and save passengers, employees and airlines billions of dollars per year.

HONORING BRENT WHITLEY FOR HIS INSPIRING EXAMPLE OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under a previous order

of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Brent Whitley, a student at Caldwell Community College in Watauga County, North Carolina. Brent recently learned about someone in the community who was battling cancer, and instead of just moving on, Brent decided to take action. His example shows what can be accomplished by people who set their minds on doing good for others.

Brent is a volunteer at Watauga Medical Center, and during his service at the hospital, he noticed a posting in the Emergency Room about the Will Dicus fund. He immediately recognized the need to help Will Dicus, a young man in Watauga County who has been courageously battling cancer for several years.

Over his college Christmas Break, Brent decided he would organize a fundraiser dance to help raise funds for Will's cancer treatment and, thus, "Dance For Dicus" was born.

Brent tirelessly planned and fund-raised, contacting churches and businesses and igniting a spirit of community service. Soon, many people were calling and offering their services and help without solicitation from Brent. All it took was the energy, ambition and selflessness of one person who simply wanted to help someone in need.

To illustrate Brent's true altruism in this situation, I learned that before he began to organize this fundraising effort, Brent did not even know Will Dicus. His desire was simply to help someone who needed assistance.

I'm pleased to report that the "Dance For Dicus" fundraiser was a success. The event raised more than \$5,000 for the Will Dicus fund and, just as importantly, raised awareness of Will Dicus' struggle with cancer. I had the great pleasure to be at the dance and see also the great number of volunteers who were there to help with the event.

Brent, who is the Student Body President at Caldwell Community College, should be inspiration for average Americans everywhere. In a time when many, many Americans are facing real struggles, Brent Whitley demonstrated the power of one person to make a meaningful difference. I applaud Brent for his ethic of community service. His altruistic example is a true inspiration during these difficult times.

THE ECONOMY AND OUR FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, I'm just delighted to be able to join you here this evening and join my fellow colleagues in talking about some really, really exciting and important topics. The first we're going to talk about this

evening is the economy and a little bit of the background on what's going on, where we've come from, where we should be going in the future. The second topic is going to be the topic of freedom.

One of the things that I have a chance to do is speaking to many audiences is to ask them, what is it that makes America such a special place? Why is it that we love our country so much? And our country is so unique in so many different ways. What is the secret to that unique nature of America? And the word that always comes out is the word "freedom." It's right near the front of the tongue for most Americans. We're going to be talking a bit about the subject of freedom tonight.

But before we do, we do need to take a look at the economy, what's going on there, and what's happened in the past and use that as somewhat of a guide as to where we should be going in the future.

The economy, of course, works on numbers. And numbers, you can't cheat with them too much. People try to, but the bottom line is, somebody ends up having to pay.

And so what we have here, going on in Washington, DC in the last number of weeks has really been incredible. We've charted absolutely new territory, I think irresponsibly. And we have heard for the last 6 years about the tremendous cost of the war in Iraq, how we're wasting money there every single day. And yet, if you add up the entire cost of the war in Iraq, which we now concede is largely won, you take those 6 years of costs, add them to the cost of what we spent in Afghanistan, add those together now, and it's not as much as what we spent in the first five weeks here in this Chamber in this supposedly stimulus bill. Many people are calling it a "porkulous" bill.

And so how is it that the economy got to the point that it would cause people to go into debt so tremendously, spend so much money?

Well, the story really goes back a number of years. It goes back to the Carter administration and really the creation of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. What happened was there were areas where it was very difficult for Americans to get home loans, and there were places where banks didn't really want to loan to people for fear that they wouldn't be paid back. And so the Federal Government created Freddie and Fannie, and those organizations are neither private nor public. They're somewhere halfway in between. And so Freddie and Fannie were given authority to help underwrite people's home loans and, actually other kinds of loans as well, but primarily for home loans.

Well, as time went along, various Presidents started demanding that Freddie and Fannie make more and more loans to people who would be considered subprime, or that's a way of saying not as good a risk. And so by the time that we had President Clin-

ton, toward the end of his tenure as President, he required an increase in the percentage of loans that Freddie and Fannie were going to make to people who were considered to be not very good risk kinds of loans. And so, what happened was, you have Freddie and Fannie now underwriting more and more loans, and you started to get a snowballing kind of effect.

At that time, in 1999, the New York Times, in its editorial page reported, I believe it was September, that several people mentioned that this is not safe, that we are starting to create the environment for another savings and loan disaster in America. This is 1999, people were warning that this policy was not a good one.

Was it a free enterprise policy?

People say the reason the economy is bad, it shows the weakness of free enterprise. No, it doesn't. What's created the problem with our economy has nothing to do with free enterprise. It's socialistic programs of government jumping in and telling banks and economists that you have to take loans which we think there's a very good chance people will not pay back.

Well, as the 1999 article in the New York Times indicated, this was a risky thing. As we move forward, we have Greenspan then reducing the interest rate, the economy getting stronger and stronger, the housing market just going up and up and up, increasing at a tremendous rate. In fact, if you looked at its rate of increase historically, you would have to start to worry that it might have been a bubble building.

Well, by 2003 we have President Bush. And President Bush has come to the Congress. He says, hey, this is reported in a September 11, 2003, article, again in the New York Times, saying, I need authority to regulate Freddie and Fannie. We have got big trouble with Freddie and Fannie. They are making all of these loans and if the real estate market comes down some there is going to be the dickens to pay. You have got to allow me to get Freddie and Fannie regulated.

And in the President's request, the Congress, in those days, run by the Republicans, passed a bill to regulate Freddie and Fannie. They sent the bill to the Senate, where it was killed, according to this article, by the Democrats in the Senate.

Now, you have, in that very article that's quoted here, the New York Times, September 11, 2003, this is the Congressman now who is in charge of fixing the problem that was created, basically, another savings and loan type of problem. These two entities, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, are not facing any kind of financial crisis, said Representative BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, the ranking Democrat on the Financial Services Committee. The more people exaggerate these problems, the more pressure there is on these companies, the less we will see in terms of affordable housing.

Now, in looking out the back window, looking through history, we see,

BARNEY FRANK was totally wrong. Freddie and Fannie are the heart of what has fallen apart and created a world economic crisis. The crisis is created by defaulting mortgages, and as that mortgage crisis has spread and continues to spread in the next couple of years, this is what's been driving the bad economy.

So there's an irony here that the person from the House that's in charge of fixing the problem is the one who created the problem. Maybe there's some humor in there somewhere, I suppose.

So I think we need to correct the rhetoric of various people that say that this is a failure of free enterprise. It's not. It's a failure of a big government program that was poorly managed, and it's like trying to make a dollar out of 15 cents.

□ 1730

You can't give people mortgages when they're not going to pay the mortgages.

Of course, it was more than just the Democrats. I'm not blaming this entirely on the Democrats. It was the start of a failure of Congress. Beyond the failure of Congress, you also had other culpable parties. You had some of the people who were rating, some of the rating agencies—Moody's and Standard and Poor's—and they were rating these mortgage securities that would have been chopped up and sold all over the world. They were rating them AAA. Now, how they could do that with a straight face, I don't know, but they fed again on the Wall Street tremendous level of speculation. So that's how we got where we are.

Now the question is: Now that we've gotten ourselves a first-rate recession going, what are the things that should be done to try to fix the recession?

There are two basic schools of thought on this subject. One of them is known as Keynesianism. It was made popular around the days of FDR. Also, it was something that was very much supported by Henry Morgenthau, who we're going to talk about in just a minute.

I do see my very good friend, Congresswoman FOXX, from North Carolina, a lady who has won all kinds of accolades in the last year or two. We think of her a little bit as the toughest grandmother in the entire U.S. Congress, and if there's anybody who is pretty long in what we in Missouri respect, which is commonsense, Congresswoman FOXX is certainly long in that.

I would yield the floor to you, gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Missouri. I hope I can tie in some of my comments with where you're going with that quote from Henry Morgenthau. We've used it a good bit recently, and I think it is a really, really good quote to share with the American people. I think we need to keep doing it over and over.

I certainly share your feeling that this is not a failure of capitalism, what

has occurred in our country recently. Indeed, it has happened all over the world.

Mr. AKIN. Could I reclaim my time for just a second? There's a little, funny story about where this quote came from of all things:

My father is 88 years old. He was reading a flyer that had been sent to him from Hillsdale College, and it was a quote out of a book called *New Deal or Raw Deal*. It has just been published. So here is my father. He gives it to me. "Son," he said, "you don't read enough. Here. Take a look at this." So we've been using it some, but I yield time to the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I'm trying to read *The Forgotten Man* right now. It's a wonderful story about what happened during the Depression and just before the Depression. I have to agree with you that we can't blame all that happened then on the Democrats, although they exacerbated the problem a lot, but I would commend that book, *The Forgotten Man*, to folks who are watching us and to anybody else. It's a history book, but it reads like a novel, and it's really a great piece.

As I said, I want to try to tie in what's going on today with something I read recently. You're right; we don't get enough time to read books. We read a lot every day, but I was thinking that we need to set aside an hour a week, at least, to read books. I'm trying to do that. It's good for our souls to read those kinds of things.

You know, Republicans have been criticized recently for not having new ideas. We've been told on this floor over and over again and we've been told by the administration that doing nothing in this situation is not acceptable, so the Democrats are doing what they say they know to do. They say our alternative is doing nothing. Well, that has never been our alternative. We've presented lots and lots of alternatives, but what we have to get people to understand is that the tried and true issue of keeping money out of the hands of the Federal Government and leaving that money in the hands of the citizens is really the best cure for this problem that ails us. Actually, it's the best cure for a society that is free, and I want to acknowledge that.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlelady, what you just made is really an important point.

What you're saying is Republicans do have an alternative, and part of that alternative is to stop spending money, but it seems like some people down in Washington, DC and a certain party have their ears plastered. They don't want to hear that as an alternative, but there is an alternative. It is the same thing that every commonsense household in America is doing, and that is, when you're troubled, stop spending money. That's a good first step, isn't it?

I yield.

Ms. FOXX. It absolutely is. Really, the root of our problem is that the gov-

ernment is spending more money than it has. When I talk in speeches or when I'm on the radio, doing radio shows or when I'm on TV, what I keep reminding people is that the government has only two sources of money—that which it takes from us forcefully, from the citizens who pay taxes—and the government does take it forcefully. Now, we know Americans have been good about paying their taxes, and they're actually willing to pay about 25 percent of their income in taxes—we know that from surveys that have been done—but it only has two ways of doing it: taking it from us forcefully or by borrowing it. Those are the only two ways because government doesn't create wealth. Government can destroy wealth, and it can destroy wealth in a hurry. What's happening with the stock market and with other savings plans is a good example of that, and I think my colleague from Missouri knows that.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, gentlelady, I think there are a bunch of us—and I'm not accusing you of this—in the baby boomer kind of category who have just seen our 401(k)s turn into 101(k)s. We understand, when the government does things the wrong way, it really can be expensive, and there are different ways. One, as you say, is to tax people. You don't have to pay your taxes. If you don't, you go to the free hotel.

Ms. FOXX. That's right.

Mr. AKIN. The other alternative is they can, of course, borrow it. Then of course, within that category, we have the other thing that we don't hear much about but which has happened extensively in the last 9 months, which is printing it, a form of borrowing it.

I don't mean to interrupt, and would yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to call to the attention of the American people an article that I read. You know, we've talked about reading. I think I read this during the Christmas holiday. It's an article by Terence Jeffrey. It was published in *Human Events* on the 5th of November of last year. The title of it is "Wanted: Small Government." I just want to read a couple of excerpts from it, and then I'm going to put it in the RECORD.

"Up until the 1930s, the United States maintained a small Federal Government that mostly focused on the limited number of things the Constitution authorized it to do.

"Americans were responsible for their own food, clothing and shelter, and if they could not take care of themselves, they looked to their extended family, their neighbors, their churches, and local governments to give them a helping hand.

"Charity in America, in those days, did not mean the Federal Government compelling you to hand over some of your property to the State so the State could hand it over to someone else.

"Americans did not believe in spreading the wealth—they believed in earning it. The term 'compassionate conservative' had not been coined.

"There was no Federal welfare state before the 1930s.

"That year, according to historical data published by the White House Office of Management and Budget, the entire Federal Government spent only 3.4 percent of gross domestic product. Because Federal tax receipts equaled to 4.2 percent of GDP in 1930, there was a Federal budget surplus equal to eight-tenths of a percent of GDP."

HUMAN EVENTS—WANTED: SMALL GOVERNMENT

(By Terence P. Jeffrey)

Up until the 1930s, the United States maintained a small federal government that mostly focused on the limited number of things the Constitution authorized it to do.

Americans were responsible for their own food, clothing and shelter, and if they could not take care of themselves, they looked to their extended family, their neighbors, their churches and local governments to give them a helping hand.

Charity in America in those days did not mean the federal government compelling you to hand over some of your property to the state so the state could hand it over to someone else.

Americans did not believe in spreading the wealth—they believed in earning it. The term compassionate conservative had not been coined.

There was no federal welfare state before the 1930s.

That year, according to historical data published by the White House Office of Management and Budget, the entire federal government spent only 3.4 percent of gross domestic product. Because federal tax receipts equaled to 4.2 percent of GDP in 1930, there was a federal budget surplus equal to 0.8 percent of GDP.

Within a decade, things changed dramatically. In 1940, Franklin Delano Roosevelt—founder of the modern American welfare state—was preparing to break George Washington's self-imposed limit of two presidential terms.

Although the nation was still at peace, the federal government had grown almost threefold—when measured as a percentage of GDP—from what it had been in 1930. Federal spending in 1940 was 9.8 percent of GDP. Federal tax receipts were 6.8 percent. The Treasury borrowed 3 percent of GDP to make up the difference.

In fiscal year 2009, according to OMB's estimates, the federal government will spend 20.7 percent of GDP while taking in 18 percent of GDP in taxes. The Treasury will borrow 2.7 percent of GDP, much of it from foreign creditors, to make up the difference.

And that does not count the \$700 billion the Treasury will borrow to fund the financial industry bailout.

Today, the federal government eats up more than twice as much of our national wealth as it did in 1940 and more than six times as much as it did in 1930.

What did Americans get for this massive increase in government? More of their life is now mortgaged to the government, and they are now more dependent on government.

Most of the growth in federal spending has come in the sector that the OMB calls "human resources." As currently budgeted, this includes federal spending on education, training, social services, health programs, veterans benefits and services, income security programs, Medicare and Social Security.

In 1940, the "human resources" part of the federal budget consumed 4.3 percent of GDP. In 2009, it will consume 13 percent, or three times as much.

Before the current economic crisis hit, the American welfare state was on an unsustainable trajectory. The Government Accountability Office informed the Senate in January that it estimated there was a \$53 trillion gap between the entitlement benefits the federal government has promised to pay over the next 75 years to people now living in the United States and the tax revenue that can be expected to pay for those benefits. Then-Comptroller General David Walker said that for the government to cover this gap every American household would need to put up about \$455,000.

That is the size of the mortgage the federal government has already taken out in the name of every American family.

We got to this place because politicians for decades have been telling voters they would give them something for nothing—when what they really meant was they would take money from one set of people and give it to another.

When they borrowed vast sums to keep their welfare-state politics rolling, they were taking money away from future generations—our children and grandchildren.

Now we are being told we face the greatest economic crisis since the 1930s. And we are being offered the same solution: more federal programs so Uncle Sam can take better care of us.

In other words, the politicians want to take out a second mortgage on top of the \$455,000 they have already put on our backs.

America is heading down the blind alley of big government toward the brick wall of national bankruptcy. The only way out is to turn the truck completely around and head back toward small government, self-reliance and freedom.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlelady, I would like to highlight what you said.

Those numbers are absolutely shocking. In 1930, you're saying the Federal Government was spending three point something percent of the GDP?

Ms. FOXX. Correct.

Mr. AKIN. Boy. Oh, boy. I'll bet you there's a lot of people who would love to see us get back to that kind of a number. Then the tax rate was four something, 4 percent?

Ms. FOXX. That's right. No. What we brought into the Federal Government was 4.2 percent of GDP. Now, that could have been in addition to—well, it was mostly taxes, I guess. That's what it was.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I sure appreciate your sharing that with us.

You know, we are joined by another very good friend of mine, Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN. She is one of our great communicators, a lady from Tennessee.

We're just delighted to have you with us, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, and would ask you if you want to chip in a little bit here in our discussion on where we are economically. I yield.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Absolutely. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the discussion that is here because, as we have all been home over the weekend and have been working in our districts, meeting

with constituents, the economy is the number one issue. I have talked to so many people who are using the words that they are appalled, that they are horrified with what they see happening here. They are very concerned with what they see taking place with the economic policies of the new administration.

Indeed, as a broker from one of our fine banks in Tennessee said to me yesterday, the stock market has voted on the Obama economic policies—on PELOSI, REID and their economic policies—and they have obviously voted "no" because the stock market was over 9,000 before this administration took control, and now we see where it is today, which is at 6,700. It is of great concern to us.

We know our Nation is in a recession. We know that people are hurting. We know that they want to see something done, and most people fully realize that you cannot declare a war on prosperity and get yourself out of a recession.

You both have recognized, Ms. FOXX and the gentleman from Missouri, the quote from Henry Morgenthau and the importance of that, which is that it does not work, that this kind of spending does not work. I brought a chart along that I felt was important to the discussion that we are having.

As my colleagues know, the Democrats took control of this body in January '07, and we see where we were with the Federal deficit, the green line. The orange line is discretionary spending, and mandatory spending is in the blue. Now, we continued to hear from the leadership—from Speaker PELOSI, from Leader REID and from the President—that they inherited this debt, that they inherited an annual deficit, but I think it's important to note that they voted "yes" on all of this. It has pushed our spending.

You can see what has happened with the spending in the past year alone. Stimulus I was \$152 billion. You'll see where it comes in there in '08, the pre-TARP funds. That was from March to September of '08, \$323 billion. Then there was TARP, the auto bailout—stimulus II—which was \$787 billion. There was the omnibus, which was \$410 billion. Now what we have seen happen with the spending is, by the end of '07, the Democrat-led House had moved our same year mandatory spending from \$3 billion to \$37 billion, and by the end of '08, they'd increased that number to \$333 billion.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I would gladly yield to the gentlelady.

Mr. AKIN. I would reclaim my time and yield. I'm the one who's supposed to do this.

This is part of the dinner conversation here. Being the father and the guy who serves the food at our dinner table, I would recognize the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield my time to the gentleman.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri yielding.

I was trying to make this point today, and I think it's so important that you've brought this up.

Let us remind the American people that the Democrats took control of the Congress in January of 2007. Do you remember—I remember—that we had 54 straight months of job growth up until January of 2007? Do you remember that number?

Mr. AKIN. Yes.

I would yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Indeed, you're exactly right. We had had job growth. We had had economic growth. It was basically unparalleled. The 2001 and 2003 tax reductions had worked. We had not seen this kind of growth since Ronald Reagan.

As the chart points out, you can look at where the Federal deficit was, which was at \$8 trillion. You can look at where discretionary spending was placed and where our mandatory spending, this blue line, was placed.

Now, what we see as the mandatory spending alone is that they grew from \$3 billion to \$333 billion in a 2-year period of time. So you can see what is happening with our spending. Whether it is our discretionary or our mandatory spending, it is going through the roof, and of course that runs our Federal deficit and our national debt up.

□ 1745

This year alone, we're at over \$2 trillion in a deficit, and our President has just proposed a \$3.5 trillion budget.

So we know what is going to continue to happen to these lines. You can look at the CBO scoring—and, see, the CBO is a nonpartisan organization. You can look at what is happening in their scoring and see that we're going to have trillion-dollar deficits as far as we can see with the tight spending that we have brought forth.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

The gentlelady from Tennessee has a very, very effective chart. And what you're pointing out is that we're in uncharted waters. We have not dared to take and swallow this much debt in the past.

I was trying to put some kind of a handle on what we passed just a couple of weeks ago on this House floor on about—I think it was—what was it, \$840 billion. Now, I don't make that much money. So I tried to think, Well, what's something big that the Federal Government buys. And because I'm on Armed Services, I think of aircraft carriers. They're bigger than tanks. They're like a whale. They're tremendous. Well, an aircraft carrier, we've got 11 of them. And they're valuable. And we put other ships around them to guard them. And we don't make aircraft carriers very often because they're so expensive.

So let's take the average cost of those 11 aircraft carriers and divide it

into \$840 billion that we just spent a couple weeks ago—money that we don't have—and you're talking about 250 aircraft carriers—can you picture that—end-to-end-to-end. This is a lot of money. Or if you want to get one of those kinds of Cadillac aircraft carriers, the big long-deck ones that really do all of the fancy stuff, you're still talking over 100 aircraft carriers. That's money that we don't have that we just spent, and it was supposed to be for stimulus; but we called it “porkulous” because there wasn't really much stimulus.

But that's talking about doing some big-time spending following that same old Keynesian idea that if the government spends enough money, that everything will be okay.

To this engineer, that's a little bit like grabbing your bootstraps, lifting up, and trying to fly around the room.

We're joined by another very good friend of mine, STEVE SCALISE, Congressman from Louisiana. I think you wanted to also talk a little bit about where we are with this level of spending and what's going on with these taxes.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from Mississippi, as well as the gentlelady from Tennessee, because as we start to see the real numbers—and the American public has been concerned about where the economy is—but they are also real concerned—and we're seeing more and more each day—real concerned about the gross level of spending that's coming out of this administration as a response to the crisis.

I think if you look at what's being presented, and as people are now starting to look and grab some of these numbers—and we're not just talking about hundreds of billions of dollars now; we're talking about well over a projected deficit of \$1.7 trillion in this budget. So it makes people harken back and say, number one, what levels do these compare to. And when you look back, you can go back—you have to go all the way back to World War II to find a budget, a level of spending that's presented in this budget, a level of spending that's as high a gross domestic product of a percentage of GDP that we've had. And we haven't had this high a level of spending since World War II.

So if you go back to World War II and, of course, the Great Depression right before it, it really sparks a lot of comparisons that are frightening. And I think that's where the public is, but that's where the markets are. I know my friend from Tennessee talked about that, too. The markets are responding to what's happening here in this city in Washington, D.C., and it's not good. Their reaction is not good, what that means for people's 401(k)s. Just in the last 2 months, people have lost 20 percent of their 401(k)s because of the results of these policies not only that were passed in the spending bill just 2 weeks ago, but this budget that's been

presented with its gross level of spending with its absorbitant level of tax increases.

So if we look here at a chart, this is a break down of the President's proposal of tax increases that's in this budget, this budget that has \$1.7 trillion of new debt—not debt that was carried over from the previous administration. The buck stops here. And this President submitted this budget, he created this new level of spending, and he's choosing to pay for some of it—clearly not all of it—but some of it by one of the largest tax increases in the history of our country.

And while he says that less than 5 percent of the people of this country will pay these taxes, this chart will show you something very different, a stark difference in what we've been hearing; \$1.4 trillion has been proposed by this President in this budget in new taxes at a time, of course, that our economy is in a recession.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time a second.

That should send the alarm bells off in people's minds. When you're having not only just a little recession but what's starting to turn into almost a depression and you're talking about huge tax increases, you don't want those two things in the same sentence, I believe.

I yield.

Mr. SCALISE. I think when we talk about, now that we're in a recession, will we be going to a depression, look at what happened in this 1920s and the 1930s as we did go into a depression. And in many cases, it was policies in Washington, D.C., that not only pushed us into the depression but kept us there for 8 years. We were in the depression for 8 years. It took World War II to get us out of it.

And if you go back to 1932, the President who raised taxes during an economic downturn that was so severe in the 1930s—Herbert Hoover raised taxes, of all things, while the country was entering a depression. In 1932, Herbert Hoover on his way out as being voted out as President, he raised taxes dramatically. We're seeing the same process followed again. And then the people say, “Those who don't learn from history are doomed to repeat it.”

When this country was entering the Great Depression in the 1930s, they raised taxes dramatically, and it helped—that and the gross level of spending—helped make that an 8-year process instead of a short depression that we could have gotten out of.

So if I can go back to this chart. Where are the taxes going to be paid? Who's going to be paying for those taxes? It's \$636 billion of those new taxes are going to be thrown onto the backs of our small business owners. So when they talk about people who make over \$250,000 a year—and I know some people want to pay class warfare and try to divide this country at a time when we need to be uniting this country and finding real solutions—they

talk about that top 5 percent. Well, who is that top 5 percent? That's the small business owners in our country who have created 70 percent of our jobs.

So if anybody can explain to me how raising \$636 billion in new taxes on the backs of those very people who are creating the jobs that our economy needs, how is that going to get our economy back on track? That's something that the markets are reacting to and people across this country are starting to realize that it's a frightening realization.

Mr. AKIN. This is something I want to be very clear in our discussion this evening. We're having this, like a dinner conversation.

What I want to make clear is that the Republicans are not just saying "no." What you're saying is, You're doing the wrong thing which will make the economy worse.

Now, what you've gotten to in your chart here is the absolute crux of what has worked in the past to pull us out of a recession. And it's not the government that pulls us out of a recession; it's the marketplace. And it's particularly the entrepreneurs and the inventors and the investors and those small business people. And what do small business people need in order to create all of those jobs—because depending on what you call a small business, you're talking 70 to 80 percent of the jobs in America come from small businesses.

So if you harm the small business guy—even though he may be fairly well-to-do—you're cutting off your nose to spite your face. And what's going to happen when you take \$636 billion out of small businesses—that's the money they need to invest in new equipment, new processes, new procedures and innovation which is going to result in hiring the people that need to be hired.

So what's happening here is this policy is economically crafted to make the problem worse.

I would yield to my colleague.

Mr. SCALISE. What you said is exactly true. And there is a double whammy on this budget on the tax increases that have been proposed. Not only do \$636 billion in new taxes get thrown onto the backs of small businesses all across this country, but then they come through the back door; and this is where the rest of the 95 percent of the people that supposedly aren't going to pay a new dime in new taxes, this is where they get hit.

This is their energy proposal on cap and trade. A carbon tax. This is something that you haven't heard a lot of people on the Democratic side talking about because as people see what this does, they realize this is where everybody else pays more money: \$646 in new taxes on energy production in this country. And, of course, all across this country as energy taxes are increased, who pays for those taxes? That's not something that they just absorb. They have the authority to pass that on to rate payers.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

I think there must be something wrong with your chart here because I was just on this floor last week, and I heard the President say that nobody making less than \$250,000 is going to pay any of these taxes. And I said, "I'm glad I'm not going to have to pay these taxes because I make less than \$250,000 a year." And now you're ruining my whole evening by telling me that that isn't true. Is that what you're saying?

I yield.

Mr. SCALISE. I'm sorry if you already ate dinner. I'm sorry to upset your stomach. But a lot of people across the country are starting to get very upset as they see the realization of these proposals because change as a concept sounds great. There are a lot of things we need to change about Washington, D.C. In fact, we've proposed an alternative H.R. 470. You can actually go on line. We put our proposals on line. We put that proposal out there weeks and weeks ago. H.R. 470 is a true alternative to get our economy back on track.

What we've been presented with, unfortunately, with this administration is the oldest failed policy that will keep us deeper in a, not only recession, but can throw us into a recession; and that is a tax-and-spend approach, which has been proven to fail every time.

So this cap and trade program right here, this is—they can call it whatever they want, but when you start having to pay higher fees on your utility bills, that's a tax to you. That's a tax increase. If your utility bill goes up and you're using the same amount of energy because of this carbon tax \$646 billion, if people across the country don't think that's going to result in something that's going to have a significant impact on their budgets as they're tightening. And people are conserving energy. People are tightening their belts.

But as they're conserving that energy, they're going to be getting hit with \$646 billion in new taxes on top of the \$636.00 billion that our small businesses will be hit with.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

You can be making \$20,000 dollars a year, and you are still going to be burning some natural gas and using some electricity; is that right?

Mr. SCALISE. That's not only right, but those people in the lower incomes are the ones that are least likely to be able to afford these massive tax increases they get on their utility bills. Because if your utility bill goes up even though you're using the same amount of energy, or in some cases you're using less energy—maybe you actually went and put some insulation in your attic because you wanted to lower your rates—this carbon tax is actually going to raise your utility bills even though you've done those things.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlemen.

You're getting me all upset. You're ruining my entire evening here. But I

have a feeling what you're telling us is true. In fact, I know it is true.

Mr. SCALISE. If I could ask for the gentleman to yield for one moment.

Mr. AKIN. I would yield for one minute.

Mr. SCALISE. There is one bit of good news. While these are difficult times, while there's a lot of bad news—and as people look at these details, it frightens a lot of people. But this has not been passed into law yet. These are proposals the President just filed this last week. We haven't even started having hearings in Congress. If people all across this country—as I'm sure they will do when they start realizing the negative impacts to our economy of these new taxes, these massive taxes—people, I think, are going to start lighting up those phones. They're going to start calling their congressmen. They're going to call the White House. And they are going to say enough is enough.

The spending and the taxes, just like in the 1930s, didn't work. Don't take my word for it. Listen to the Treasury Secretary under FDR. This has been tried before and it's failed before. Not only did it fail, it pushed us into a deeper depression. And I think the public across this country is going to say, "Enough is enough. We're not going to take these new taxes and this ridiculous level of spending," and the public can stop this.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time.

I think you're a little bit of a prophet, gentlemen, because they were dumping tea in the river in St. Louis this last weekend. I think people are starting to get wise and they're getting upset.

I also am just thankful that we're joined by a very good friend, a very distinguished colleague from this House, Congressman PENCE from Indiana.

I would yield time to my good friend. I know that you have very good insights on these issues.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him and all of my colleagues who will speak here this evening for taking the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to come to this floor and talk about facts.

Facts are stubborn things. And it seems like we're living in a time right now of soaring rhetoric. But the facts underpinning the Democrat budget are jarring, and they represent a fundamental departure from the course of American governance.

□ 1800

And we need to talk about those things. I mean, the American people understand that the Federal budget is, in itself, the way a party and an administration lays out its vision for the future of the country. The American people deserve a budget that is fiscally responsible and puts jobs first. And as has been said on the floor before, the budget offered by this administration and supported by our Democratic colleagues in the House fails on both

counts. The American people know we can't borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy.

And history has shown that the policies that are embraced in the Obama budget will actually take our country not out of recession, but very likely deeper into recession. The last President of the United States to raise taxes during a recession was Herbert Hoover, who managed, by his deeply flawed judgment and policies, to take a strong recession in the 1920s and turn it into a decades-long depression in this country. And yet here we stand again at a crossroads in our Nation's history when so many families are hurting, so many small business owners are struggling under this economic downturn.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentleman, what you're saying is we're just not learning from history. It's not that the economy is brand new, there are patterns here. It's not that the Republicans are the party of "no," it's the fact that these solutions don't work and they're going to hurt our constituents, and that's why we get a little excited about them.

I mean, here you have the quote from Henry Morgenthau, he is the guy that, along with little Lord Keynes, came up with Keynesian economics. And he says, After trying it for 8 years, our theory didn't work. Our unemployment is as bad as it was before, and now we're in debt. And what we're trying to say is, don't accuse us of not having solutions, the solutions are there; but don't repeat history's mistakes.

I didn't mean to interrupt, but just continuing to yield to my good friend from Indiana, Congressman PENCE.

Mr. PENCE. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his typical eloquent insight. We are not paying attention to history. We are not learning from the candid comments like the Secretary of the Treasury under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who realized at the end of America's lost decade of the 1930s that they couldn't borrow and spend their way back to a growing nation. And yet here we are again.

But I hasten to add, not only are we piling on our children and grandchildren a mountain range of debt to pay for—beginning with the stimulus bill, and now the omnibus bill, and now the President's budget—a transformation of government spending priorities along liberal lines, but they intend to pay for it, in part—because we're talking about record deficits. Even if the President hits his deficit reduction mark in 4 years, it will still be a half a trillion dollar deficit, which I remember Democrats decrying during Republican control of the Congress. But beyond all that, they're going to pay for it, in part, with tax increases on small business owners and family farmers.

As the gentleman just described very eloquently, the American people deserve to know a couple of facts. Seventy percent of Americans work in

small businesses in this country and in places like Indiana; 70 percent of people get up and go to work every day in a small business. More than 50 percent of the American people who file income tax returns at or above the level that the President intends to raise taxes are small business owners filing their taxes as individuals. And so we ask the question, Mr. Speaker, of the American people looking in, do you think raising taxes on your employer at the small business where you work is a pathway to recovery in America? Is it going to make your job more secure or less secure? Leave aside the so-called cap and trade bill, but raising the utility rates, the electrical bills for every homeowner in America, every business in America—

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, gentleman, what you're suggesting is, one, what's being done is exactly the wrong thing. And if you want a positive Republican recommendation, it would be to do the opposite of that, right? In other words, what we would be saying would be, look, if you've got 70 or 80 percent—depending on how big you call a small business—if that's where 70 to 80 percent of the jobs in America are, you want those small businesses strong. How do you make them strong? They have to have enough liquidity, enough capital to be able to invest in entrepreneurial ideas, to put in more productive assembly lines or machines or processes. So you have to invest, and you have to let that money work for you. And you have to leave it with the small businessman. But if you vacuum it out of his pockets with massive tax increases, he's not going to have the money to invest, and he's going to lay off more people, it's going to make things worse. So the solution is, quite simply, leave more money for the small businessman and back off the spending pedal a little bit.

I don't mean to get overexcited. I want to yield again to my good friend from Indiana, and then go to a wonderful new Congressman from Wyoming.

Mr. PENCE. Let me say as I close, I want to thank the gentleman for leading this hour of debate and say that there are two things that Republicans believe we ought to be doing. Number one is, we ought not to be growing the Federal budget beyond any reasonable expectation of the American people. We shouldn't be engaging in the runaway spending of the so-called stimulus bill, the omnibus bill and the President's budget. We ought to be doing what every family farm, every small business, every working family is doing, and that is finding places to save, finding places to cut back. And then, as the gentleman said, we ought to be doing what John F. Kennedy did, we ought to be doing what Ronald Reagan did, we ought to be doing, as a country, what this Congress and George W. Bush did after the Towers fell, and that is, not giving Washington more money of ours to spend, but giv-

ing working families, small business owners, family farmers more of their hard-earned tax dollars to keep and spend. That's the pathway to prosperity.

The President's budget, the Democrats' plans are a pathway to increased recession and hardship for the American people, and we must reject them.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I reclaim my time. And I would once again thank the gentleman from Indiana for joining us.

We have all kinds of expertise here tonight. And Congresswoman LUMMIS from Wyoming, my understanding is Wyoming has only got one Congresswoman, if I'm correct.

I yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to participate in this discussion.

As a new member of the Budget Committee, I learned today that the President's budget would project the levels of spending in the war in Iraq at the same level that they are during the surge, and use that dollar amount and project it out to the year 2019. It does not account for the fact that President Obama has decided to withdraw combat troops from Iraq in August of 2010, but for this manner: if you project that spending is going to go up when you factor in inflation until 2019 at surge levels, and then you project that we're going to withdraw troops, that gives you \$1.6 trillion that the administration is choosing to spend on other programs. In other words, that money won't be saved, it will be redirected into other components of this President's budget.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, are you saying in a way you've almost got a sneaky cut in defense spending?

I yield.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you for yielding. It does, in a way, accomplish just that because it's taking money that is being spent on defense now and rerouting it into domestic spending that is discretionary and creates new programs. Now, I would not object to that but for the fact that this increased spending is in addition to new taxes. And the gentleman was accurate in pointing out the effect that that will have on small business.

As you know, my State of Wyoming is all small businesses, that an individual tax rate of \$200,000 will trigger a tax increase, that filing jointly at \$250,000 in income will trigger a tax increase. And correctly you have pointed out that the brunt of that is going to fall on small business.

Small business has been pegged as the opportunity for growth in this country through the entrepreneurial free enterprise ethic. And if that ethic is thwarted through high taxes, that will be a component of our country that is not growing. That is the component of our country that is creating 70 percent of the new jobs. So as large employers lay off employees because they were "too big to fail" and then failed

anyway, it would be a robust small business community that could absorb them if the tax structure were such that those monies could be made available by expanding the entrepreneurial spirit.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, lady, I think what I'm hearing you say is what we've been trying to emphasize all the way along.

There are a couple of basic things we need to do with the situation that we're in, a situation that was created not by free enterprise, but by failed government programs that issued a whole lot of loans with government guarantees on them that people weren't going to pay. And so we got ourselves in a lot of trouble, but it doesn't mean that it's the end of the world. There are ways to fix these problems.

America has been through a lot of hard times. A lot of people are kind of discouraged right now, but they don't have to be. There are solutions, it's been done before—J.F.K. did it, Ronald Reagan did it, even Bush did it in 2003. You can see the result of the dividend capital gains—the exact effect of what you're talking about, putting money in the pocket of the small businessman—not putting it in, but just letting him keep it, just getting off the taxes on the small businessman.

And look what happens here to gross domestic product. These are the years of Bush before this tax cut went in place. And take a look at what jumps. You go from an average of 1.1 percent to 3.6 year after year because of the fact you did just what the wise woman from Wyoming is saying.

And then if you want to say, well, what happens when GDP goes up? Well, here you go; here's what the job numbers look like; same time period, May 2003, we do the dividend capital gains tax cut. These are all job losses below the line, everything above the line is a job gain. It's an investment just basically allowing a small business, like an engine, to have enough liquidity and money to be able to make it run so that it can create those jobs and put America—and the other chart that we're missing is what happens to Federal revenues. And Federal revenues go up like a rocket because you've got all these people working and the economy going strong.

We are also joined here this evening by Congressman CHAFFETZ from Utah. And it is just a delight to have you on the floor and to hear from some people out west. So I hope that you enjoy joining our little dinner conversation this evening.

I yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I appreciate it.

I am deeply concerned about the direction of this country. I know there are people out there that are suffering.

I recently had an opportunity go to the Payson City Chamber of Commerce and meet with small local business people. The Mayor was there, Mayor

Burtis Bills, a wonderful gentleman. These people are all concerned about the economy. They all have their own businesses, from an auto repair shop, to a local flower business, to a home-based business that was just kicking off and won an award.

The direction that we're taking with our Federal government I believe is an impediment to the success of those people. As I looked them in the eye, I didn't have anything to tell them that the stimulus or this budget would truly help them with. This budget takes from the American people; it doesn't give more of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And fundamentally, that's what we here in the United States Congress are supposed to be doing. It's about who is going to control the destiny of our country.

I believe in less government. The President says he believes in less government. But when you look at the budget, it's more government, it's more government spending.

I'm mystified when they make the argument—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, last week we voted on what was called an omnibus. It was basically nine budget bills all in a row stacked together. And the result of that, just on the surface, was an 8 percent increase, which if you don't believe in increasing government, why kick it up by eight? That's the largest increase since back in the seventies under Jimmy Carter, Democrat Jimmy Carter. But 8 percent is really what it was because you've got to put all that porkulous money into the budget. When you do that, it's an 80 percent increase in the growth of all of these government programs.

Somebody wrote a little note to me, I went to a Lincoln Days talk this weekend, and they said, the trouble with socialism is it that sooner or later you run out of other people's money. And I thought, that sounds like something that might have possibly been coined out in Utah. It's just common sense.

I will yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. If the gentleman would yield.

You know, as we look at this, I liken it to a house. The furnace has gone out; it's the middle of the winter and the furnace has gone out. So what are we going to do? Well, we've been off re-decorating the kitchen and we've remodeled the basement and we bought new drapes. We did everything except fix the furnace. And that furnace is the American entrepreneur, it's that man or woman who is going to start their local business. And you've got to look at the stimulus and say, what's in it for them? Less than 1 percent was tax cuts for that type of person, less than 1 percent.

□ 1815

We said we were going to build roads and bridges and rebuild America; yet only 3.4 percent of that stimulus actually went to those types of activities.

So I think you have to look at it through the lens of the American entrepreneur, the small businessman who's truly going to create that job. How are they going to grow their business from 10 to 20 employees? I visited with somebody in my office earlier today who had 64 employees. The question for us is how are they going to get to 100? And it's not more government. It's not funding these outrageous programs that are going to do nothing for that local entrepreneur.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, I really appreciate your perspective. And I wish we had a little bit longer amount of time to talk with you because I'd love to get into that subject of freedom a little bit. But I know that we've also got a little Texas wisdom here in the Chamber here tonight, and I just feel like it would be a shame not to yield to Congressman GOHMERT from Texas, actually a former judge and a gentleman noted for a good sense of humor as well, and we need a good sense of humor on this subject; so I would yield to my good friend Congressman GOHMERT from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend's yielding.

Actually, I don't have a lot of humor to throw into this issue tonight. But I had read a Wall Street Journal article today. It was in today's Wall Street Journal. And just the opening paragraphs, if I might share that because there's a lot of wisdom in here:

"As 2009 opened, 3 weeks before Barack Obama took office, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed at 9034 on January 2, its highest level since the autumn panic. Yesterday the Dow fell another 4.24 percent to 6763, for an overall decline of 25 percent in 2 months and to its lowest level since 1997. The dismaying message here is that President Obama's policies have become part of the economy's problem."

And to finish up here:

"Americans have welcomed the Obama era in the same spirit of hope the President campaigned on. But after 5 weeks in office, it's become clear that Mr. Obama's policies are slowing, if not stopping, what would otherwise be the normal process of economic recovery. From punishing business to squandering scarce national public resources, Team Obama is creating more uncertainty and less confidence and thus a longer period of recession or subpar growth."

"The Democrats who now run Washington don't want to hear this because they benefit from blaming all bad economic news on President Bush."

This is the Obama economy now. The jobs that are being lost are because companies are finding no hope in this latest stimulus whatever you want to call that package or all the other spending.

And I appreciate the gentleman's yielding because I do find this very distressing. We're in the Obama economy.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, it does my heart a great deal of sadness

to see my friend from Texas without a little bit of a twinkle in his eye, which is so commonly there. But this is a very serious subject. We try not to yell and scream too much about it, but we know that economically what's being done is going to harm our constituents. It's getting rid of jobs. It's making the small businessman have to basically shutter down and to keep his operation small, which is exactly the wrong thing for what we should be doing.

And why is it that we need all of this money? That is the question that I think we need to be asking. Why is it that we have to be spending all this money on government programs? And the answer seems to me to be, again, we're not learning very well from history. Just bear with me for a second. I'd like to get your perspective on this.

A certain number of years ago, there was a thing called the Soviet Union, and they were bad guys. And they were a bunch communists and they were socialists. And what was it that they thought? They thought the job of the government should be to provide you, first of all, with a job, and then they wanted the government to give you health care and food and housing and an education. And one thing particular about them, they didn't want you to talk about God ever.

Now, in our country, let's see, we've got all this government spending going on so the government can provide you with health care and a job and food and housing and an education and it's politically correct not to talk about God because if you did that, gentlemen, you'd realize your rights come from God. Life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, not big government nanny state. And I just wanted to toss that out to you to see if I could get a response from my good friend from Texas.

I yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. If we have time, when I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union back in 1973, I went out to a collective farm, and I've worked on farms and ranches. It was about mid morning. The farmers obviously hadn't been working. The field was suffering. And I said in what Russian I could speak back then, "When do you work in the field?"

And they all laughed. And one spoke for them in Russian and said, "I make the same number of rubles if I'm out there in the field or if I'm here in the shade."

That is why socialism doesn't work.

Mr. AKIN. So reclaiming my time once again, the problem with socialism is sooner or later we run out of other people's money.

That concludes our 1 hour. I just thank all of my colleagues from all over the country joining us tonight. Next week we will try to get into freedom a little more heavily, but the economy is certainly a top topic and that's why we have given it a lot of attention this evening.

God bless you all. Good night.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of constituent business in the district.

Mr. PERRIELLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. KING of Iowa (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of the birth of his grandson.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, March 4 and 5.

Mr. CALVERT, for 5 minutes, March 4.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 10.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today and March 9.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today, March 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 10.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, March 4 and 5.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the fol-

lowing titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Installations and Environment, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to cancel the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 public-private competition for the Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC) Safety Support Services competition at locations nationwide; to the Committee on Armed Services.

755. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's report on allegations involving the Department of Defense Office of Public Affairs Outreach Program, pursuant to Public Law 110-417, section 1056(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; 2009 Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Boston-Manchester-Portsmouth (SE), New Hampshire, 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area. [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0485; A-1-FRL-8771-3] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nevada: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R09-RCRA-2008-0726; FRL-8771-8] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Florida [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0605; FRL-8769-5] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for North Carolina [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0681; FRL-8769-6] received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

760. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting

the Board's report entitled, "Report to The U.S. Congress and The Secretary of Energy," pursuant to Public Law 100-203; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

761. A letter from the Executive Director, Human Rights in China, transmitting a background report relating to the recent Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of China's human rights record at the United Nations in Geneva; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

762. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Alabama Advisory Committee, pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

763. A letter from the Project Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Consolidation of Merchant Mariner Qualification Credentials [Docket No.: USCG-2006-24371] (RIN: 1625-AB02) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

764. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Fuel Cell School Buses," pursuant to Public Law 109-58, section 743(c); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

765. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's report on the Board of Veterans' Appeals' activities during Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

766. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Automatic Contribution Arrangement [TD 9447] (RIN: 1545-BG80) received February 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

767. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Critical Skills Retention Bonus program for military personnel, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 323(h); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1253. A bill to require that limitations and restrictions on coverage under group health plans be timely disclosed to group health plan sponsors and timely communicated to participants and beneficiaries under such plans in a form that is easily understandable; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. DENT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1254. A bill to make the Census Bureau an independent establishment; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr.

POE of Texas, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1255. A bill to protect the interests of each resident of intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded in class action lawsuits on behalf of such resident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr.

PLATTS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILROY, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1256. A bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1257. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to require the disclosure of information relating to the fair market value and safety of damaged motor

vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 1258. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee):

H.R. 1259. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the distribution of the drug dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1260. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 1261. A bill to protect the public health by establishing the Tobacco Harm Reduction Center within the Department of Health and Human Services with certain authority to regulate tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1263. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the automatic enrollment of new participants in the Thrift Savings Plan, and to clarify the method for computing certain annuities based on part-time service; to allow certain employees of the District of Columbia to have certain periods of service credited for purposes relating to retirement eligibility; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan):

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for the national flood insurance program to make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms or floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of

Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1265. A bill to restrict the use of offshore tax havens and abusive tax shelters to inappropriately avoid Federal taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. HIRONO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1266. A bill to provide for retirement equity for Federal employees in nonforeign areas outside the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 1267. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain property and personnel of the Department of Defense to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit issuance of residential mortgages to any individual who lacks a Social Security account number; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1269. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdiction over questions under the Defense of Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Mr. BACA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. KILROY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr.

MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1270. A bill to reauthorize community development block grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1271. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2351 West Atlantic Boulevard in Pompano Beach, Florida, as the "Elijah Pat Larkins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1272. A bill to provide for the conversion of a temporary judgeship for the district of Hawaii to a permanent judgeship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. ARCURI):

H.R. 1273. A bill to honor Susan B. Anthony by celebrating her legacy on the third Monday in February; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1274. A bill to permit employees to request, and to ensure employers consider requests for, flexible work terms and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 1275. A bill to direct the exchange of certain land in Grand, San Juan, and Uintah Counties, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1276. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1277. A bill to repeal the emergency fund for the TANF program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1278. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Shirley Chisholm; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 1279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limits to dependent care flexible spending accounts and to provide for a carryover of unused dependent care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1280. A bill to modify a land grant patent issued by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1281. A bill to provide for the return of the Fresnel Lens to the lantern room atop Presque Isle Light Station Lighthouse, Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1282. A bill to authorize the Commandant of the Coast Guard to convey to the City of Marquette, Michigan, certain real property under the administrative control of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr.

ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN,

Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1283. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the readiness of the Armed Forces by replacing the current policy concerning homosexuality in the Armed Forces, referred to as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell", with a policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1284. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 West Main Street in McLain, Mississippi, as the "Major Ed W. Freeman Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. CAO):

H.R. 1285. A bill to establish the Commission on the Foreclosure and Mortgage Lending Crisis; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana):

H.R. 1286. A bill to amend the Act titled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes" to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of lands that are contiguous to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana):

H.R. 1287. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a partnership with the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission regarding the use of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center as a visitor center for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 1288. A bill to halt Saudi support for institutions that fund, train, incite, encourage, or in any other way aid and abet terrorism, to secure full Saudi cooperation in the investigation of terrorist incidents, to halt the issuance of visas to citizens of Saudi Arabia until the President certifies that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not discriminate in the issuance of visas on the basis of religious affiliation or heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1289. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution establishing a bipartisan Joint Select Committee on Long-Term Financial Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States regarding the right of all citizens of the United States to a public education of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of citizens of the United States to health care of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to equality of rights and reproductive rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution proposing an amendment the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to a clean, safe, and sustainable environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxing the people of the United States progressively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to full employment and balanced growth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the Electoral College and provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President by the popular vote of all citizens of the United States regardless of place of residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER,

Mr. BACA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. SIRE, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 203. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. TERRY,

Mr. KIRK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr.

KILDEE, Mr. BARROW, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 204. A resolution congratulating the American Dental Association for its 150th year of working to improve the public's oral health and promoting dentistry, supporting initiatives to improve access to oral health care services for all Americans, and emphasizing the benefits of prevention of disease through support of community prevention initiatives and promotion of good oral hygiene; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Kumi Iizuka-Barcena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1291. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to convey to the Cornerstone Christian Academy, located in Cheboygan, Michigan, certain real property under the administrative jurisdiction of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 16: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 17: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 22: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 24: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 90: Ms. Markey of Colorado.

H.R. 111: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 144: Mr. FARR and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 154: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 174: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

H.R. 211: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. KILROY, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 235: Mr. HARE, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 265: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. STARK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 270: Mr. ROSS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. CARNEY, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 303: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BOYD, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 305: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 307: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 370: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 393: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 398: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 406: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 426: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 450: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 460: Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. Peters.
H.R. 479: Mr. MACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HILL, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 503: Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 510: Mr. SHULER and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 513: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 528: Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 548: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 558: Mr. SPACE and Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 560: Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 562: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 606: Mr. FARR and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 613: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 618: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 626: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 627: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 666: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 667: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 676: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 704: Mr. LEE of New York.
H.R. 744: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 745: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 753: Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 756: Mr. SESTAK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LOEBACK.
H.R. 775: Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 784: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 785: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 804: Mr. BARROW, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 848: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 858: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 875: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 909: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 914: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 946: Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 952: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STARK, Mr. MASSA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BACA, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 958: Mr. FILNER and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 968: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 978: Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 980: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 983: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 984: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HODES, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 985: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 997: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 1006: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1024: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1064: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1067: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 1081: Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 1083: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1085: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1090: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 1091: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1117: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1126: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 1136: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1150: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1151: Mr. HIMES and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1152: Mr. HIMES and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1153: Mr. HIMES and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1154: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1173: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 1197: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1199: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1203: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1204: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1205: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1210: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1211: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 1221: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1224: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1228: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1229: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1246: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.J. Res. 26: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SPACE, Mr. HODES, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STARK, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. HARE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WU, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 49: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 65: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 69: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H. Res. 76: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Ms. BALDWIN.
H. Res. 81: Mr. PETRI.
H. Res. 109: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H. Res. 111: Mr. WAMP, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 125: Mr. LANCE and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 130: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. DEFazio.
H. Res. 146: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 152: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCMAHON.
H. Res. 153: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H. Res. 156: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H. Res. 171: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 175: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 178: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. INGLIS.
H. Res. 185: Mr. CAO, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Res. 187: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 200: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.